THE MEMORIAL

QUARTERLY JOURNAL of SPEECH

Speech Association of America

OCTOBER · 1958
Volume XLIV · Number 3

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

1915 — 1958

Published by
THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Editor
Donald C. Bryant
11-A Schaeffer Hall
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Associate Editors

Carroll C. Arnold	BRITISH PUBLIC ADDRESS	Cornell University
Wallace A. Bacon	INTERPRETATION	Northwestern University
Earnest S. Brandenburg	ADULT EDUCATION	Washington University
Robert D. Clark	HOMILETICS AND PREACHING	University of Oregon
Carl A. Dallinger	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	State University of Iowa
Douglas Ehninger	PUBLIC SPEAKING AND FORENSICS	University of Florida
Leland M. Griffin	AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS	Northwestern University
Robert G. Gunderson	NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW	Indiana University
Warren Guthrie	TV AND RADIO	Western Reserve University
Marie K. Hochmuth	RHETORIC AND CRITICISM	University of Illinois
John V. Irwin	SPEECH AND HEARING	University of Wisconsin
Magdalene Kramer	TEACHING OF SPEECH	Teachers College, Columbia University
Richard Murphy	SHOP TALK	University of Illinois
David Potter	BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL SPEAKING	Michigan State University
Claude L. Shaver	DRAMA AND THEATRE	Louisiana State University
C. K. Thomas	PHONETICS	University of Florida
William E. Utterback	DISCUSSION	Ohio State University

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH is published in the months of February, April, October, and December. Contributions prepared in accordance with THE MLA STYLE SHEET may be sent to the Editor or to the appropriate Associate Editor. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to Owen Peterson, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge 3, Louisiana.

Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice at Columbia, Missouri, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Regular subscription price $5.50 per year. Special subscriptions for undergraduate students $3.50 per year. Single copy of current issue $1.50. A comprehensive Index of the issues of the year is bound in each December JOURNAL. The contents are also indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX. For volumes prior to 1929 consult the READERS GUIDE TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE. For complete, analytical coverage through 1954, see INDEX TO THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, VOLUMES I-XL, 1915-1954, compiled by Giles W. Gray (1956). Volumes I-III were published under the title THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING; Volumes IV-XIII, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION.

Copyright 1958 by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOL. XLIV · OCTOBER 1958 · NO. 3

Free Speech, Persuasion, and the Democratic Process	*Thomas R. Nilsen*	235
Gladstone's Characteristics as a speaker (The British Orators, IV)	*Albert A. Austen*	244
Yucca in the Painted Desert: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1957-1958	*Alan S. Downer*	255
Hugh Blair's Theory of Taste	*Herman Cohen*	265
The Comic Tennessee Williams	*Charles Brooks*	275
John Udall and the Puritan Sermon	*Everett H. Emerson*	282
Notes on Debating in the British Isles	*Waldo W. Braden*	285
Medical and Psychological Aspects of Speech and Voice Disturbances	*Emil Froeschels*	294
On Talking a New Language	*W. Norwood Brigance*	299
The Forum		303
Editorial Mid-Term	*D. C. B.*	303
Today's Speech Revisited	*Robert T. Oliver*	304
To the Editor	*Barnet Baskerville*	306
Interpretation—Chant or Rant	*Irving Deer*	307
Whither Rebuttal?	*Lloyd I. Watkins*	308
SAA Elections, 1958		310
Editorship of *QJS* and *SM*, 1960-1962		311
Correctness Defended	*Dorothy Childs*	311
New Books in Review	*Robert G. Gunderson*	313
The Cornell Idiom	*Loren Reid*	313
Frontier Bishop: The Life and Times of Robert Richford Roberts	*Robert D. Clark*	317
Prelude to Independence: The Newspaper War on Britain	*Harry P. Kerr*	318

Magnificent Missourian: The Life of Thomas Hart Benton	*Norman W. Mattis*	319
What Roosevelt Thought: The Social and Political Ideas of Franklin D. Roosevelt; *and* Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal	*Waldo W. Braden*	319
Al Smith and His America	*Hollis L. White*	320
Law for the Public Speaker: Legal Aspects of Public Address	*D. Tyner Brown*	320
Human Motivation: Probability and Meaning	*Robert T. Oliver*	321
The Dynamics of Planned Change: A Comparative Study of Principles and Techniques; Leader Attitudes and Group Effectiveness; *and* Social Process in the Community and the Group	*Elwood Murray*	322
Psychopathology of Communication	*Otis M. Walter*	323
The Principles of Semantics; *and* Modern Linguistics	*John B. Newman*	324
The Uses of Argument	*Winston L. Brembeck*	325
International Propaganda: Its Legal and Diplomatic Control	*Walter B. Emery*	326
TV and Our School Crisis	*Henry L. Mueller*	327
Mass Communications: A Statistical Analysis	*Kenneth G. Hance*	327
The Theatre in Soviet Russia	*Hubert Heffner*	328
Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners	*Kalman A. Burnim*	330
Medieval English Poetry: The Non-Chaucerian Tradition	*Herbert C. Feinstein*	330
The Astor Place Riot	*John Gassner*	331
The Theatre of Robert Edmond Jones	*Richard Moody*	332
J. B.	*E. E. Wilson, Jr.*	333
The Playwright's Art: Stage, Radio, Television, Motion Pictures	*Jerry C. McNeely*	333
Literature Considered as Philosophy: The French Example	*John H. McDowell*	334
The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism	*Wallace A. Bacon*	335
The Dimensions of Robert Frost	*W. M. Parrish*	335
Oral Interpretation and Literary Study	*Alethea Smith Mattingly*	336
Audiology: Principles and Practice	*John W. Black*	336
The Development and Disorders of Speech in Childhood	*Mildred C. Templin*	337
And So We Speak: Voice and Articulation	*James H. Platt*	337
Principles of Public Speaking	*Hayden K. Carruth*	338
Practical Speaking for the Technical Man	*H. L. Ewbank, Jr.*	338
Briefly Noted		339
Books Received		341
Shop Talk	*Richard Murphy*	343

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLIV OCTOBER 1958 NUMBER 3

FREE SPEECH, PERSUASION, AND THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

Thomas R. Nilsen

SINCE the advent of mass advertising, professional public relations, and motivation research, persuasion has been used on a scale of such magnitude with techniques of such refinement as to raise with renewed urgency the problem of its relationship to traditional democratic principles. It is the purpose of this paper to examine some of the current techniques of persuasion in the light of these principles.

I.

To those of us who have lived our lives in a democratic society the democratic process may seem to be a pattern of simple and natural ways of organizing the political relationships of men. We may readily take for granted its methods, its values, its opportunities. Yet that this process is complex and difficult is attested to by the slow and laborious way societies learn to live by such means, and by the ways in which presumably democratic procedures can become inimical to the established democratic society in which they function; that is to say, by the ways in which democracy can undermine itself in the name of democracy.

How democracy began, of course, we do not know, but some speculation about its beginnings may help point up certain of its essentials. It seems reasonable to suppose that when the needs of survival and well-being stimulated the codification of reciprocal obligations among men, we had the beginnings of, or at least the basis for, democracy. We might assume that the establishment of simple codes of procedure for relationships among men fostered a primitive glimpse of human values. The elimination of totally arbitrary relationships, or arbitrary rule of men over men, may well have led to some sense of value in man as man, some inviolable essence in his nature that other men had no right to dominate.[1] This concept of value could further have influenced the procedures to make possible a greater realization of the values at first only dimly conceived. It was, no doubt, a long and painful process, with progressions and regressions. It is still going on.

To understand the implications of

Mr. Nilsen (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1953) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Washington.

[1] See Walter Lippmann, *The Good Society* (Boston, 1937), pp. 374-376.

modern persuasive techniques we must recognize that democracy is at once a pattern of procedures and a pattern of values; the values must influence the procedures, and the procedures must continuously recreate the values, if democracy is to perpetuate itself. The values it seems to me are these: a belief in the intrinsic worth of the human personality; a belief in reason as an instrument of individual and social development; self-determination as the means to individual fulfillment; man's fulfillment of his potentialities as a positive good. The procedures are unrestricted discussion and debate, various forms of public address, parliamentary procedure, legal processes, and publicly defined rules of evidence and tests of reasoning. An educational system that will adequately equip citizens to think and to discuss is implied.

If democracy is to function, ideas need to be expressed, the ideas need to be critically examined, the best ideas need to be found, and these ideas need to be accepted by the people if they are to be effectively translated into policies. For the expression of ideas we have freedom of speech and assembly, and freedom of the press. That ideas may be examined, understood, and tested, we have discussion and debate, and tests of evidence upon which all can agree. To gain acceptance of ideas we have persuasion. Since issues are complex, interests widely disparate, and apathy only too common, persuasion plays an important part. And herein lies our problem. Persuasion can take many forms, and it can have varied effects. Since it is one of the important procedures by which democracy is carried on, we must inquire whether persuasion in any given case serves to reinforce and perpetuate the democratic process or to weaken and circumscribe it. It will be noted that our concern here is not with the end toward which people may be persuaded, but with the process of persuasion itself.

2.

Persuasion, the inducement in others of belief or action, is an essential part of any society, for ultimately government, whether democratic or totalitarian, rests upon some form of support in public opinion. In a democratic society regular procedures exist to make that public opinion instrumental in affecting government. The influencing and shaping of this public opinion then becomes of extreme importance. This paper, in viewing persuasion in the democratic process, will be limited to some of the most significant persuasive techniques used by professional public relations and advertising men in political campaigns. The use of professional PR and ad men in campaigns during the past decade has intensified some of the old and introduced some new problems for democratic society.

Although our concern here is not with persuasion as used in the PR of business but persuasion as used in the political arena, some understanding of the former is necessary to an understanding of certain biases of the latter. Historically, the PR man's role has been primarily to create and foster favorable attitudes toward a business or a product. Higher sales and increased profits have been the immediate and the ultimate objective,[2] but there have been by-products of various kinds. The need for favorable public attitudes has fostered much that is good in commercial activity; it has fostered a larger social

[2] The success of PR and advertising in business is attested to by the enormous increase in money invested in it in recent years. See Vance Packard, "The Growing Power of the Ad Man," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CC (September 1957).

view and an increasing sense of community responsibility. It has also given rise to many skills and techniques in influencing public opinion. These techniques have grown out of the need for creating favorable public attitudes in as short a time as possible as inexpensively as practicable. All possible short cuts are taken, the most telling appeals are used, the critical faculties are by-passed as much as possible. There is in commercial selling, it would appear, a built-in bias toward simplicity and emotional appeal, and against complexity and critical appraisal. It is the past decade that has seen a dramatic introduction of these methods of merchandising on a mass scale into the area of political campaigning.

The editor of *Tide*, an ad and sales publication, remarked during the 1952 campaign that "advertising demonstrated beyond question that it can sell a good idea as successfully as it can sell a good product."[3] Among the many techniques used in the selling of ideas and candidates I shall briefly point up seven: the concentration on "issues," the emphasis on attack, the use of timing, the use of the "appeal beyond politics" and the "negative appeal," the elimination of debate, and the mass distribution of ideas. These methods, of course, frequently overlap, and are often used in combination.

The concentration on issues is sometimes explained by the PR professional as education. For instance, Leone Baxter of the Whitaker and Baxter team says:

> It's because the public relations profession, and its allied professions, know something about presenting abstract ideas, in attractive form, to masses of people who are too occupied with their daily lives to think analytically on their own account, that the average man of today is in a position to know more about the trends of human affairs than ever before in history. . . . You are helping him to understand your clients and their problems, their ideas. You are helping him to be a better citizen.[4]

But the issues on which the campaign concentrates are usually, if not always, the issues chosen by, or at least shaped by, the propaganda specialist for their impact value, and by no means necessarily because they are the real or significant issues in the campaign.

Closely related to the emphasis on "issues" is the emphasis in the campaign on attack. "To attack is to press on the public," says Mr. Whitaker, "the issues that are to one's advantage. To attack is not just to give one's side of the question but to *define* the political situation."[5] A powerful attack forces the opposition to reply and to explain, and, further, the attacked group is not able to get to the issues it considers important, or is able to get to them only after wasteful expenditure of time and resources.

In campaigns careful use is also frequently made of timing. Campaigns are given a sense of movement or build-up which has nothing in particular to do with the importance of the issues. The mass media of communication permit such a steady build-up of intensity and enable the arousing of maximum interest and excitement just before the elections. One firm reserves about 75% of its expenditures in a campaign for the final three weeks before the voters go to the polls.[6]

[3] William L. Miller, "Can Government be Merchandized?" *Reporter*, IX (October 27, 1953), 11.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[5] Stanley Kelley, Jr., *Professional Public Relations and Political Power* (Baltimore, 1956), p. 48. I wish to acknowledge a special indebtedness to Mr. Kelley. His timely book came to my attention while I was gathering material for this paper. In his book much of my work was done for me, and I have used his material liberally.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52.

While the mass media do provide many opportunities for propaganda, they also impose some limitations on method. Through the mass media a great many people are reached, but they are not likely to be giving close or continuous attention to what they read or hear. As a consequence, for maximum effect issues are condensed into themes or slogans to catch the attention of the indifferent voter and to make the issues able to compete with the other mass media content such as sports, soap operas, and murder mysteries. How this indifference on the part of the people and the competition of other content are dealt with is explained by Mr. Whitaker in a statement that apparently sums up his basic philosophy:

> The average American, when you catch him after hours, as we must, doesn't want to be educated; he doesn't want to improve his mind; he doesn't want to work, consciously, at being a good citizen.
>
> But there are two ways you can interest him in a campaign, and only two that we have ever found successful.
>
> Most every American loves a *contest*. He likes a good hot battle, with no punches pulled. He likes the clash of arms. So *you can interest him if you put on a fight!*
>
> No matter what you fight for, *fight for something*, in our business, and very soon the voters will be turning out to hear you, providing you make the fight interesting.
>
> Then too, most every American likes to be entertained. He likes the movies; he likes mysteries; he likes fireworks and parades. He likes Jack Benny and Bob Hope and Joe E. Brown!
>
> So if you can't fight, PUT ON A SHOW! And if you put on a good show, Mr. and Mrs. America will turn out to see it.[7]

This philosophy leads to what is called the "appeal beyond politics." In order to compete with entertainment on the mass media, Campaigns Incorporated, the Whitaker and Baxter firm, makes politics entertainment.

Such a philosophy leads also to a primarily "negative appeal" in politics. The indifferent voter is moved by being confronted with an imminent evil, something threatening to things as they are, against which he himself must fight. Apparently it is easier to arouse people to be *against* something than to be *for* something.

Fundamental to the public relations man's approach is the elimination of debate and of competing propaganda. In 1949 the *Dallas Medical Journal* carried some advice from Whitaker and Baxter (these two people figure so largely as a source here because of their extraordinary success in this field, and the availability of their comments:

> We do not believe it is sound campaign practice to sponsor too many debates. They would make a forum for the opposition which would be difficult for them to secure otherwise, and they are too easily stacked. This is particularly true of broadcasts to the public.[8]

This is apparently standard technique in the Campaigns Incorporated firm.

> In their plan of campaign for Governor Goodwin Knight's 1954 campaign, they [Whitaker and Baxter] say, "What about debates? Our Candidate is a master of this field, so we regret to say we will schedule no debates with our opponents. We should not permit the stature of the Governor to be utilized to build audiences for his opposition."[9]

Closely related to the elimination of debate and opposing propaganda is the method of mass distribution of "ideas." This method is simply that of providing almost endless repetition of the so-called issue and virtually crowding out competing ideas. Some indication of how this method is used is provided by Whitaker's description of media used for a ballot proposition in 1948. In that year, to publicize one issue to California's 4½ million voters Whitaker's

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

[9] *Ibid.*

firm put out 10 million pamphlets and leaflets, 4½ million post cards, 50,000 letters, 70,000 inches of newspaper display advertising in 700 daily and weekly newspapers, theatre slides and trailers in 160 theatres playing to nearly 2 million people each week, 3,000 radio spot announcements on 109 radio stations, plus radio programs, billboards, posters, speeches, etc., reaching millions of people.[10]

3.

What are the implications for the democratic process of the persuasive techniques used in this growing business of merchandizing government?

It might be argued that the philosophy and methods which have been briefly described here have long been the stock in trade of politicians in a democratic society. And this is true, with some significant differences. The politician has not previously had available to him the mass media to the degree that a well-financed public relations firm now has, nor has the politician had the professional skills and contacts necessary to use the mass media to their capacity. A modern public relations firm has the accumulated experience of many professional propagandists, the know-how to use the media. Moreover, with the engineering of a campaign concentrated in one headquarters with the bulk of the resources to work with, coordination of use of mass media is greatly increased.

A difference too can be noted in the place of the press in modern society. Political issues traditionally have been given publicity through a free press and not by professional propagandists. Now, however, as Mr. Kelley points out, "For the public relations man the press and the other media are not only distributors of information but instruments of social control, and the media have for various reasons been forced to accept this estimate of themselves."[11] He quotes a Texas editor as stating:

> The fact remains . . . that any editor worth his salt knows that he is just about as dependent upon the public relations man as they are upon him. . . . No newspaper could afford the staff it would take to turn out the vast amount of news that fills the papers every day.[12]

The scope or extent of the social control function of the press is indicated by a *Fortune* magazine statement that now "nearly half the content of the nation's better newspapers comes from publicity releases."[13] Publicity releases, we may remind ourselves, are not random revelations of information but statements carefully chosen for the effect they will have.

There is a difference too in the relationships of the present day professional persuader to the issues and to the people he persuades. The politician by himself at least had some direct contact with his constituents. He was or might become their official representative, and out of this relationship there grew at least some sense of direct responsibility. The ad man brought in to sell a candidate sees the candidate and the voters with much greater impartiality. He has a product to sell, and the voters are buyers. As one ad man put it, "I think of a man in a voting booth who hesitates between two levers as if he were pausing between competing tubes of toothpaste in a drugstore. . . . The brand that has made the highest penetration on his brain will win his choice."[14] The politician only rarely perhaps has

> approached the immaculate amorality of the political public relations man who, admitting that his candidate did not know anything about

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[11] *Ibid.*, p.204.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

[14] Robert Bendiner, "How Presidents are Made," *Reporter*, XIV (February 9, 1956), 18.

anything, said, "Let's consider this campaign clinically. After all, you don't criticize a brain surgeon's technique just because he operates on a criminal."[15]

So much for the differences between modern public relations technique and traditional political persuasion. Now what of the processes of persuasion as seen in professional public relations and their relationships to the democratic process? Certainly a basic principle in the larger democratic process is that of majority rule. This principle implies that large numbers of citizens must make definite choices, often on gravely complex issues. If freedom of choice is to have meaning there must be adequate information upon which to base the choice, and if self-determination is to have meaning there must be significant alternatives whose implications are known among which to choose. Most of the persuasive methods of professional public relations and ad men have the net effect of reducing the opportunities for free and rational choice based on adequate information. Not that it is to be expected that the whole truth is ever going to be presented. The truth is too complex, even if it were known. But much more of it can be told than is told. Perhaps the most serious violation of the basic principle comes in the implication that the truth is being told, that the issues are simple. "The theory of our constitution," said Mr. Justice Holmes, "is that truth is the only ground upon which man's wishes safely can be carried out."[16] "In the democratic thesis," says another writer, "facts provide the basis for free judgment and decision."[17]

[15] Miller, p. 12.

[16] Walter Lippman, *Liberty and the News* (New York, 1920), p. 13.

[17] Ralph Block, "Propaganda and the Free Society," *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, XII (Winter 1948-49), 678.

Coupled with the lack of significant information, the oversimplification of issues, and the selection of issues for their propaganda value is the deliberate attempt to avoid competing ideas. This is done by deliberately avoiding public discussion and debate, by forcing the opposition to answer attacks, and by overpowering opposing views by sheer massiveness of material and by continuous presentation of views. Such techniques, of course, directly violate the basic principles of constructive debate so important to the democratic process. As Walter Lippmann has put it in *The Public Philosophy*:

> Freedom of speech has become a central concern of the Western society because of the discovery among the Greeks that dialectic, as demonstrated in the Socratic dialogues, is a principal method of attaining truth, and particularly a method of attaining moral and political truth. . . . The method of dialectic is to confront ideas with opposing ideas in order that the pro and con of the dispute will lead to true ideas. . . . And because the purpose of the confrontation is to discern the truth, there are rules of evidence and of parliamentary procedure, there are codes of fair dealing and fair comment, by which a loyal man will consider himself bound when he exercises the right to publish opinions.[18]

And elsewhere:

> Thus the essence of freedom of opinion is not mere toleration as such, but in the debate which toleration provides. . . . We must insist that free oratory is only the beginning of free speech; it is not the end, but a means to an end. The end is to find the truth. The practical justification of civil liberty is not that self-expression is one of the rights of man. It is that the examination of opinions is one of the necessities of man.[19]

The need for the opposition of ideas is one of the basic tenets of the democratic faith. What makes the violation of this principle of particular signifi-

[18] (Boston, 1955), pp. 124-130.

[19] Walter Lippmann, "The Indispensable Opposition," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXIV (August 1939), 189.

cance now is that with the use of modern PR methods employing the media of the press, radio, and television, the process of debate is circumscribed, relative to the number of people involved, to a degree never before seen in our democratic society. The principle has, of course, always been violated, but the problem takes on a new dimension when millions of people can be delivered up to one speaker on one occasion. To the side with the most money to buy the most favorable time goes the opportunity for the maximum saturation with its ideas with the least possibility of competition. The saturation spot campaign is a significant example of the elimination of competing ideas, in addition to oversimplification. As explained by a PR man, its advantages are these: "(1) It gives maximum effectiveness of penetration and recall without becoming deadly to the listener and viewer. (2) It delivers this maximum just before election. (3) It occurs too late for effective . . . rebuttal."[20]

The reply might be made that this is simply another manifestation of the democratic process. Suppose the views are partisan; in the competition of the market the best views will prevail. The citizen still has a choice. If it were true that opposing sides were nearly equally represented by PR firms this might be partially true. But then we would have the interesting spectacle of a political struggle being waged not between candidates and issues but between public relations professionals, which would make success very much dependent upon financial backing and propaganda skills. It would be highly doubtful whether the significant issues in the campaign would ever be presented. As a matter of fact, however, such competition between PR firms in political campaigns is not likely to occur. As we are well aware, not one of the major public relations firms would work for the Democratic candidate in the last national election. As one executive put it: "You see how it is. If a big agency took on the Democrats' account and the Democrats won, it would simply enrage Republican clients and drive them away. On the other hand, if it took them on and the Democrats lost, it wouldn't look too good for its selling ability"[21] The public relations firms whose primary source of accounts is business, particularly "big business," are not impartial about whose side they are on in a political campaign.

But there is more than the elimination of competition in the market place that concerns us. There is also the problem of individual responsibility for what is said. In one of the Lippmann passages quoted above it is pointed out that there are rules of evidence and of parliamentary procedure, and codes of fair dealing and fair comment, by which the loyal man will consider himself bound when he exercises the right to publish opinions. There has been a strong tendency in our society to escape personal responsibility for what is said by retreat to the traditional position that it is the competition of the market place that will determine which ideas have merit. I cannot better describe the dangers of such "intellectual laissez-faire" than Alexander Meiklejohn has done. I shall quote him at length:

> There is undeniably a genuine though partial validity in the dictum that "the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." It rightly tells us that the only truth which we self-governing men can rely on is that which we win for ourselves in the give and take of

[20] Kelley, p. 189.

[21] William H. Hale, "The Politicians Try Victory Through Air Power," *Reporter*, XV (September 6, 1956), 20.

public discussion and decision. . . . But that partial insight has often been interpreted . . . to be a total characterization of the truth seeking process. And, in that form, it has become . . . a fruiful source of intellectual irresponsibility and of the errors which irresponsibility brings. We . . . have taken the "competition of the market" principle to mean that as separate thinkers, we have no obligation to test our thinking. . . . Each one of us, therefore, feels free to think as he pleases, to believe whatever will serve his own private interests. . . . Our aim is to "make a case," to win a fight, to make our plea plausible, to keep the pressure on. And the intellectual degradation which this interpretation of truth-testing has brought upon the minds of people is almost unbelievable. Under its influence, there are no standards for determining the difference between the true and the false. . . . The dependence upon intellectual laissezfaire, more than any other single factor, has destroyed the foundations of our national education, has robbed of their meaning such terms as "reasonableness" and "intelligence," and "devotion to the general welfare." It has made intellectual freedom indistinguishable from intellectual license.[22]

The persuasive techniques in question are also inconsistent with the democratic process in that they tend to eliminate checks and balances. In the area of government, no matter how able and good the man, we do not permit him arbitrarily to make laws and enforce them. We do not trust any human being with power over other human beings that is not circumscribed by careful checks and balances, except temporarily in times of emergency. The modern persuader with vast financial resources and the mass media at his disposal has in a very real sense great power. Prior to the day of publicity releases in volume, prior to press, radio, and TV chains, there were more checks and balances in the form of more independent and diversified press coverage, more direct contact with constituents, more confrontation in debate. With millions of listeners and viewers reached at once, with money to buy the time of favorite shows, with money to print fabulous amounts of literature, with a predetermined point of view on the part of major PR agencies, the checks and balances have been drastically reduced, reduced almost in proportion to the added power of the forces that need to be held in balance.

Further, the persuasive techniques we have discussed are inconsistent with the fundamental democratic view that the human being is inviolable, that he is not to be treated as a thing, as a means, but as a person, as an end. This right seems to be respected for the physical person, but the persuasive methods of the professional public relations man in political campaigns reveal a dramatic failure to respect the personality in the same way. The more the reader or listener can be made to respond in fear or anger, the more readily he responds to suggestion, the less he makes use of his critical faculties, the less he is induced to inform himself, the more successful the PR and ad men are.[23] In other words, the fewer the distinctly human qualities of reason, self-determination, individuality which men develop, the better for the political advertising profession. And the worse for democracy, which is based on the assumption that citizens can and will make informed and rational choices.

Fundamental to the whole problem of persuasion in a democratic society is the problem of ends and means. And this is of direct concern to the teacher of speech who in various forms teaches

[22] Alexander Meiklejohn, *Free Speech and Its Relation to Self-Government* (New York, 1948), pp. 86-87.

[23] For a discussion of modern advertising technique and "motivation research" see Vance Packard, *The Hidden Persuaders* (New York, 1957), and his article referred to above.

The recent development in persuasion known as the "invisible sell' suggests the frightening lengths to which those who sell are willing to go in influencing behavior.

persuasion. Persuasive techniques are usually classed as means, means to some end which may be good or bad. While we may not hold that the end always justifies the means, we place the emphasis on the ends when making ethical judgments about persuasion and thus take the onus off the means. The extreme of such thinking is suggested by the familiar scalpel analogy. The scalpel is neutral; it can be used to take a life or save a life. Whether it is used for good or ill depends upon who is using it, the end he seeks. And so with persuasive techniques. This view is, of course, grievously shortsighted. The reason is simple: The scalpel does not form habits of cutting or the patient habits of behavior as a result of the operation. Persuasive methods, on the other hand, do influence behavior apart from and in addition to the particular end which they seek. When being persuaded a man is not only influenced directly or indirectly in his choice of a course of action, he is influenced in his *method of making the choice*. The problem of ethics enters when what we do affects the lives of others. How we influence others to make choices about things of importance to them is obviously affecting their lives in a significant way.

In a democratic society—I do not think it can be denied—the method of decision is vital; *how* we go about making up our minds is vital. Whether we vote for a particular candidate in a particular election may not be momentous for democracy, but how we make up our minds about candidates is indeed momentous. By constantly limiting the critical faculties in decision we are limiting the basis upon which it is possible to have a responsible citizenry, and thus we weaken the very foundations of democracy.

There is, of course, no intention here of implying that all human behavior should or can be completely "rational." Today we are aware that our behavior results from a large variety of motivations; our needs, desires, anxieties, conscious and unconscious, play an important part in what we do. We also know, however, that much careful, reflective, critical thought is needed on the part of all citizens, leaders and followers alike, if we are to deal with our myriad domestic and foreign problems within the democratic framework. Indeed, because of the large component of irrationality in all of us, all the more do we need to make a deliberate and continuous effort to increase the amount of rationally controlled behavior, based on democratic values, in all areas of common concern.

Most of the average citizen's political actions consist of making choices between alternatives presented to him. When we determine how he makes his choices, we determine to a large extent the kind of person he is and the kind of citizen he is, whether he is a person who grows in his ability to make rational choices and develops the capacities that make him truly a man, or whether he tends toward the robot whose control buttons substitute for independent choice. And we determine whether as a citizen he strengthens the democratic community or weakens it.

Freedom of speech, which includes the freedom to persuade, imposes on everyone who exercises that right an obligation to use speech so that it becomes a carrier of freedom. "Free speech is promoted by the kind of speech that makes men free."[24]

[24] Max Ascoli, *The Power of Freedom* (New York, 1949), p. 67.

THE BRITISH ORATORS, IV

GLADSTONE'S CHARACTERISTICS AS A SPEAKER

Albert A. Austen

GLADSTONE entered Parliament in January 1833, but it was not until December 1868, thirty-five years later, that he first reached what Disraeli appropriately termed "the top of the greasy pole." Nevertheless, it was fortunate for him, as Winston Churchill has observed, "that supreme power did not come too soon."[1] It was in those three and a half decades of varied parliamentary apprenticeship, under such men as Peel and Palmerston and during his long journey from the ranks of the Conservatives to the leadership of the Liberal party, that he acquired the knowledge and experience which enabled him to remain in power for yet another quarter of a century.[2] It was during these years, too, that he slowly brought to maturity the skills which won him his contemporary reputation as one of the most distinguished parliamentary debaters of the century. Though, as was predicted in his own time, his speeches are no longer widely read and his fame as an orator has failed to survive him, that fame was not unmerited and, in fact, was of central importance to his career.[3]

From the beginning to the end of his public life Gladstone was essentially a debater. His training for this role began in childhood, and he himself continued it in school and college. In his prosperous, middle-class, Scottish home it was common custom, encouraged by his father, for members of the family to dispute the most ordinary matters, such as whether a window should be opened or closed, or whether an insect which had found its way into the room should be killed or allowed to escape. To a large extent, Gladstone carried with him into Parliament the contentiousness engendered by this early, family habit of arguing almost every subject without regard to its importance. At Eton and at Oxford he took prominent part in literary and debating activities. In addition, he read systematically in the classics, including the Greek and Roman orators and rhetoricians, as well as such modern students of rhetoric as Blair,

Mr. Austen (Ph.D., Cornell, 1957) is Assistant Professor of Speech at Rutgers—The State University of New Jersey.

[1] *History of the English-Speaking Peoples* (London, 1958), IV, 76.

[2] The chief government and party offices which Gladstone held were: Under-Secretary for the Colonies, 1835; Vice-President of the Board of Trade, 1841-1843; President of the Board of Trade, 1843-1845; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1852-1855, 1859-1866, 1873-1874, 1880-1882; leader of the Liberal party, 1868-1875, 1880-1894; Prime Minister, 1868-1874, 1880-1885, 1886, 1892-1894.

[3] Speaking ability was regarded as the essential key to political preferment in Parliament in the nineteenth century. See George Henry Francis, "Sir Robert Peel," in *Orators of the Age* (New York, 1847), pp. 7-16. Gladstone's political career was guided at several critical points by speeches which he made. His speech against the Reform Bill at the Oxford Union, in 1831, indirectly earned him his first seat in Parliament. His three-hour attack on Disraeli's budget of 1852 opened the way for him to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer in the following year. His celebrated Midlothian campaign speeches, 1879-1880, were influential in returning him to the Premiership for the second time in 1880.

Campbell, and Whately.[4] To Aristotle's *Rhetoric* he gave special attention, and in 1838, five years after he entered Parliament, he wrote an essay on "Public Speaking"[5] in which he described the immediate, spontaneous, non-introspective method of speaking which he thought should distinguish the debater from the maker of set speeches or orations. In its emphasis upon establishing "fraternity" with the mind of the audience, upon the free and impromptu use of voice and action, and upon the importance of sensing the mood of the moment of speaking may be seen the theory which he himself was to practice for more than fifty years in and out of Parliament. The essay is a revealing self-portrait of Gladstone's own future role as a House of Commons speaker.

As a result of his rhetorical philosophy and of his early training, Gladstone developed the habits of the professional debater, which in time brought him the enormous fluency which characterized his speaking. His speeches and remarks in Commons occupy upwards of 15,000 columns in Hansard. From the middle of the 1860's he delivered hundreds of speeches outside the House as well. Moreover, he published many volumes and several hundred articles and reviews; his personal correspondence at its peak numbered many thousands of letters, notes, and postcards. It is no wonder he once said to Morley that he was never at a loss for words.[6] Though fluency and volubility were conspicuous hallmarks of Gladstone's rhetoric, his speeches were usually grounded upon a thorough grasp of argument and detail which he acquired through months and, sometimes, years of patient and exhaustive research. Thus the ready command of intricate financial matters which he demonstrated in his first budget speech, in 1853, was largely the result of information that he had painstakingly gathered during his years at the Board of Trade. Moreover, he was blessed with an extraordinarily retentive memory. He could quote accurately facts and phrases which he had used as many as twenty or thirty years before. It was an ability which, in his later years, placed his younger opponents at a marked disadvantage, an unfailing resource upon which he depended for his remarkable readiness of speech.

Essentially, Gladstone's language was that of the experienced nineteenth-century parliamentarian. Except for one particular quality, it was easy and flowing but, at the same time, prosaic and lacking in any attempt at eloquence or rhetorical embellishment. Unlike Disraeli's it lacked originality; it was not epigrammatic. Gladstone was not a maker of phrases.[7] Even in reply, where many said he was at his best, he was ordinarily heavy-handed, literal, and characteristically indignant.[8] Rather than any particularly meritorious quality of style, it was his readiness in argument and his spirited delivery which

[4] Loren Reid, "Gladstone's Training as a Speaker," *QJS*, XL (1954), 379.

[5] "Gladstone's Essay on Public Speaking," ed. Loren Reid, *QJS*, XXXIX (1953), 265-272.

[6] "Mr. Gladstone," Address by John Morley at Manchester, *Living Age*, CCXXXI (1901), 595.

[7] See Alfred F. Robbins, "Mr. Gladstone's Phrases," *Gentleman's Magazine*, CCLXXX (1896), 20-31. Mr. Robbins' defense of Gladstone as a phrase-maker is not convincing. The most original coinages which he claims for him are "correctional," "sarcast," for a sarcastic person, and "squarson," for squire-person. Of these, only the first has currency today. The famous "bag and baggage," which Gladstone used in connection with the Turks, may be found in the language of that most natural philosopher, Touchstone.

[8] A good example may be found in Gladstone's reply to Disraeli, during the debate over the Reform Bill of 1866, after the latter had accused him of having reversed his position on the franchise from what it had been when he was a student at Oxford in 1831. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, CLXXXIII, columns 129-130.

gave point and effectiveness to his refutation. He did not know how to turn his opponents aside with deft and polished phrases. Only on rare occasions did his language rise above the level of common-place parliamentary debate, and even then it owed much to the dramatic nature of the moment and of his delivery.

Stylistically, Gladstone was at his best in his platform and budget speeches. In the former, he did adjust to the exigencies of time and his audience's limited knowledge of parliamentary affairs by shortening and simplifying his remarks. His budget speeches were acclaimed as models of exposition of fiscal and economic data. It was here, amid the complexities of financial detail, that the intricate cast of his mind fused with the fluency of his tongue to make order out of seeming chaos, that the burden of exposition took precedence over his natural propensity for argument. With confidence and delight he moved among the masses of figures, measuring them always against the watchword of his economic philosophy —economy.

In one respect, however, Gladstone's style was unusual and that was in its inordinate complexity. It was the one characteristic of his language which drew more comment from his critics than any other. His habit of elaboration took the form of qualifications, circumlocutions, and prolixities of all kinds. Basically, though, they seem to have been either mere superfluous verbal interpolations or apparently sincere attempts to spell his meaning out in all possible detail. In either case, the effect was often obscurity rather than clarity. It was only his masterful use of inflectional variation and pauses that enabled him to make the patterns of his elongated sentences clear. It was his ability, as one observer put it, to speak in italics which permitted House reporters to take down his words, confident in the knowledge that they would "read" after they had been completely transcribed.

An exceptional example of Gladstone's use of involved language may be found in the speech of resignation which he delivered to Parliament on February 3, 1845.[9] Briefly, the circumstances were these. In 1838, Gladstone had published a volume entitled *The Church in its Relations with the State, in* which he had attacked the government's annual grant to the Catholic college of Maynooth in Ireland and had "warned his fellow-countrymen that a mortal danger of corruption must be the consequence of that weak display of tolerance."[10] In 1844, Peel, then Prime Minister, proposed to triple the annual £3000 grant to Maynooth College, to make it permanent, and to incorporate the College. By 1845, Gladstone's view of the matter had softened and he was inclined to approve Peel's proposals. With a delicacy that mystified opponents and colleagues alike, he refused to do so as a member of the Government because he thought that his action would reflect adversely upon the Administration. He, therefore, felt that he had no choice but to resign from his position as President of the Board of Trade. His speech of resignation lasted almost an hour; it was an unrelieved mass of vague and subtle rationalizations which mirrored plainly Gladstone's own tortured state of mind on the occasion. At one point in the speech he said:

> I should not, however, venture upon such a step [explanation] if it were not that I feel the acts of public men to be acts in which the

[9] Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, LXXVII, columns 77-80.

[10] Sir Philip Magnus, *Gladstone* (London, 1954), p. 68.

public at large have a great concern; and, therefore, although it be irksome and offensive to detain a public assembly charged with high functions by matters in which self occupies too prominent a position, my purpose is, in point of fact, to remove misunderstandings and misapprehensions which, without some explanation, might exist, and which, relating to others as well as to myself, might prejudicially affect the public interests.[11]

When Gladstone had finished speaking, Cobden expressed what probably was the feeling of most of his listeners: "What a marvellous talent is this, here have I been sitting listening with pleasure for an hour to his explanation, and yet I know no more why he left the government than before he began."[12]

So prevalent was the complexity of Gladstone's language in Parliament that his critics made many attempts to account for it. One writer put it down to his appreciation of the difficulties involved in spoken communication.[13] Bagehot said that it was due to the fact that he had the "contentious impulse," the temperament which makes it "a positive pain to him to be silent under questionable assertions, to hear others saying that which he cannot agree with."[14] Both T.P. O'Connor and James Bryce, however, attributed his complex style to his being a Scotchman. "The subtlety, the long qualifications, the scarcely distinguishable distinctions which he makes—these are the things which every Scotchman will understand, and which your typical Englishman utterly despises and instinctively distrusts."[15] Gladstone's chief biographer, Morley, said simply that it was the result of a "scruple of conscience," his point being that Gladstone was afraid of being indefinite and unclear, with the result that he piled phrase upon phrase, sentence upon sentence until he achieved precisely the effect that he wished to avoid.[16] Less sympathetic commentators than Morley, however, labelled it "verbal duplicity" and credited it to Gladstone's desire to protect himself from attack. They pointed out that his tendency to quibble over words often gave him the appearance of being superficial and insincere.

Nevertheless, in the balanced view of his contemporaries Gladstone was more than a mere nineteenth-century Polonius. In their best construction, his endless rephrasings sprang from his vitality and exuberance, from his lifelong habit of argumentation, from his considerable knowledge of the particular question involved, and from the fluency which he cultivated from his days at Eton and Oxford. Even in conversation he tended toward monologue, and the fact that his listeners occasionally found him less than interesting is indicated by a remark of his most loyal supporter, Mrs. Gladstone, when she exclaimed. "Oh, Willie dear, if you weren't such a genius, you'd be such a bore."[17] Fortunately for Gladstone, his age was one which was tolerant of lengthy statement. As Wingfield-Stratford has pointed out, it was

so convinced of the sanctity of labour, there was little corresponding to the modern demand for economy of effort. The Victorian had a tough mental digestion, and did not expect his food to be dished up to him in highly

11 Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, LXXVII, column 77.

12 John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (New York, 1932), I, 278.

13 "Mr. Gladstone," *Fortnightly Review* XLII (1884), 564-565.

14 Walter Bagehot, "Mr. Gladstone," in *Biographical Studies* (London, 1881), p. 93.

15 T. P. O'Connor, "The Candour of Mr. Gladstone," *The Contemporary Review*, LVI (1889), 367. See also James Bryce, *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (New York, 1903), pp. 403-404.

16 Morley, I, 210.

17 Edward Lyttleton, "Mr. Gladstone," *The Quarterly Review*, CCLXXI (1938), 318. See also Georgina Battiscombe, *Mrs. Gladstone: The Portrait of a Marriage* (Boston, 1957), p. 82. This latter book provides a relatively rare glimpse, through from the distaff side, into the private life of Gladstone.

spiced or tabloid form. He delighted in three-volume novels; in set speeches lasting for hours on end—as when Palmerston held the House spellbound from the dusk of one June day to the dawn of another.[18]

This feat of Palmerston's was one which Gladstone duplicated several times during his sixty years in Parliament.

There is no doubt that his major stylistic deficiency injured Gladstone's reputation as a speaker.[19] To a man of lesser ability it would have been an insuperable handicap. But Gladstone compensated for his "infirmity" by the extraordinary power of his delivery. It reflected his vigorous and forceful personality and, in time, the prestige which he gained as a leading statesman of the Victorian era. Agreement among his contemporaries was practically unanimous that it was the most effective aspect of his speaking. In 1884, H. D. Traill, noted author and journalist, published a violent but penetrating attack on Gladstone in the form of an imaginary conversation between Edmund Burke, the eighteenth-century orator, and the nineteenth-century political figure, Edward Horsman. The dialogue laments the decline of aristocratic and middle-class control of government as a result of the extension of the franchise to the lower classes. At the same time, it condemns the rise of the demagogue to political power. Gladstone is anonymously cast in this role; he is said to be "the most ambitious of all men who ever mistook ambition for public spirit."[20] Yet, in describing the source of his power as an orator, Horsman, in the dialogue, says:

> Sir, I can only tell you that profoundly as I distrust him, and lightly as, on the whole, I value the external qualities of his eloquence, I have never listened to him even for a few minutes without ceasing to marvel at his influence over men. The white-hot face, stern as a Covenanter's, yet mobile as a comedian's; those restless flashing eyes; that wondrous voice, whose richness its northern burr enriches as the tang of the wood brings out the mellowness of a rare old wine; the masterly cadences of his elocution; the vivid energy of his attitudes; the fine animation of his gestures—sir, when I am assailed through eye and ear by this compacted phalanx of assailants, what wonder that the stormed outposts of the sense should spread the contagion of their own surrender through the main encampment of the mind, and that against my judgment, in contempt of my conscience, nay, in defiance of my very will, I should exclaim: "This is indeed the voice of truth and wisdom. This man is honest and sagacious beyond his fellows. He must be believed; he must be obeyed." And if such be the effect, however temporary, that this remarkable man produces upon me who distrust him intellectually and dislike him morally, judge, sir, how powerfully he must influence those who bring to him ready sympathies and a confiding mind.[21]

What Traill said here, through Horsman, about the effectiveness of Gladstone's delivery may be taken at face value. It is representative of a large number of similar observations of Gladstone made by his contemporaries. Even Carlyle, who was cautious and disapproving of Gladstone in other respects, is reported to have written of

[18] Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, *Those Earnest Victorians* (New York, 1930), p. 146.

[19] That Gladstone, himself, was aware of it may be seen in a reply to an attack on him in the House for having made a statement containing an "enormous involution." In answer he said: "In dealing with the speech of my right hon. Friend I will confine myself to answering the Question he has put, and which he is quite entitled to put to me. At the same time, I think my right hon. Friend was rather severe in his criticism on the unfortunate peculiarity of my style; however just the castigation, it was cruel and crushing—coming with the weight of my right hon. Friend's literary judgment upon my natural infirmity, which, in a long Parliamentary life of 40 years I have in vain endeavoured to correct. Whether involved or not, I will try to be intelligent upon the present occasion." Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, CCX, column 1828.

[20] H. D. Traill, *The New Lucian* (London, 1884), p. 189.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 198-199.

him on the occasion of his valedictory address at the University of Edinburgh in 1865:

I had been in Edinburgh and had heard Gladstone make his great oration on Homer there on retiring from office as Rector. It was a grand display. I never recognized before what oratory could do, the audience being kept for three hours in a state of electric tension, bursting every moment with applause. Nothing was said which seemed of moment when read deliberately afterwards; but the voice was like enchantment, and the street when he left the building was ringing with a prolongation of cheers.[22]

On no occasion was Gladstone's mastery of the external aspects of speaking more apparent than in his "victory" over an angry crowd of his constituents at Blackheath on October 23, 1871:

He had been taunted with inattention to his Greenwich constituents, many of whom had suffered by the reduction of Dockyard establishments. Conservatives dared him to show his face in the neighborhood; Liberals declared that it would be unwise, impolitic, and dangerous to risk such a visit, considering the excited and hostile state of public opinion. Mr. Gladstone, entirely unmoved by either reason, announced that he would be glad to meet his constituents (literally in the open) on a Saturday afternoon, so that the working classes might attend. The vast arena of Blackheath Common was selected for this demonstration of Mr. Gladstone's courage.

Accompanied by his wife, he drove up in an open carriage punctually to the time, and saw a marvellous sight. Between fifteen and twenty thousand people stood in serried ranks, ready to howl at, and even injure their member. Mr. Gladstone rose and, bareheaded, faced the great throng. For several minutes angry shouts from thousands made his voice inaudible. At length the patient determination and quiet dignity of the man caused silence. Then, as by the wand of a magician, one of the most extraordinary victories was won by straightforwardness and eloquence. The silence, as the speaker proceeded, became breathless, despite the discomfort of the huge crowd which swayed in front of the platform, and stretched far into the distance. In the waning light of the October afternoon, Mr. Gladstone consummated his personal triumph by a grand peroration. Then those who had come to insult and assault him rushed forward with a common impulse, and surrounded the orator with hands eager to clasp his. The air rang with cheers for Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone, and what had been prophesied would be a fiasco proved a magnificent success.[23]

In each of the two traditional aspects of delivery, voice and gesture, Gladstone's qualities were remarkable. His voice was vigorous, penetrating, and particularly melodious. It was often described as "bell-like" or "silvery" and capable of great variation in modulation and resonance. These, in fact, are the terms which the noted scholar, H. C. Wyld, used after listening to a recording of Gladstone's voice.[24] From all accounts it was the voice of a man who was completely in harmony with his profession as a speaker; it radiated the serenity of absolute belief which Gladstone appeared to have toward any question which he discussed.

During his early years in Parliament Gladstone's use of gesture was graceful but quiet. Though he gave the impression of having great dignity, he apparently kept his body and his arms in constant motion. He did not employ any particular set of gestures, though like most professional speakers he had a few conscious or unconscious ones that he evidently favored. The following account is a description of his appearance in the House during the 1830's:

Mr. Gladstone's gesture is varied, but not violent. When he rises, he generally puts both his hands behind his back, and having there suffered them to embrace each other for a short time, he unclasps them, and allows them to drop on either side. They are not permitted to remain long in that locality, before you see

[22] J. Ewing Ritchie, *The Real Gladstone* (London, 1898), pp. 234-235.

[23] David Williamson, *Gladstone, the Man* (London, 1898), pp. 113-115.

[24] H. C. Wyld, "The Best English," *SPE* Tract, No. 39, p. 618.

them again closed together and hanging down before him. Their reunion is not suffered to last for any length of time. Again a separation takes place, and now the right hand is seen moving up and down before him. Having thus exercised it a little, he thrusts it into the pocket of his coat, and then orders the left hand to follow its example. Having granted them a momentary repose there, they are again put into gentle motion; and in a few seconds they are seen reposing vis-à-vis on his breast. He moves his face and body from one direction to another, not forgetting to bestow a liberal share of his attention on his own party.[25]

In his prime, however, after he had risen to positions of responsibility and prominence, Gladstone's gestures became much more pronounced and vigorous. He was constantly aware of the various divisions of his audience, speaking directly to individual members of the opposition, swinging about to face members of his own party. On one occasion, during the peroration of one of his financial speeches, he is reported to have leaned over the table in Commons and to have twisted his head upwards, slowly addressing the representatives of the press in the gallery above him to make certain they could record every word he said. Like Disraeli, he was regular in his attendance in the House, where he followed the remarks of relatively unknown members with the same close attention that he gave to its leading figures. But while Disraeli sat quietly for hours, his face an impenetrable mask which gave no clue as to his thoughts, Gladstone constantly shifted about in his seat, writing messages, conferring with colleagues, leaning forward with his hand cupped over his ear better to catch what the speaker was saying, and often leaping up to interrupt or to demand a clarification. Even when he was not speaking he was often the center of interest to visitors in the gallery who came to watch the drama that he provided. His opponents were well aware of the tense, restless manner in which he followed debate. Thus it was easy for them to tempt him to reply, and certain of them indulged in a regular practice of "Gladstone-baiting," partly to enjoy his demonstrative display when he heard himself being misquoted or challenged. Among the most successful of the baiters was Lord Randolph Churchill who, on one occasion, drew the following reaction from Gladstone:

When Lord Randolph had made an end of speaking, Gladstone sprang up with catapultic celerity. For a moment he held on to the box on the table at arm's length, drawing himself up to fullest height with a genial smile on his countenance that completed the contrast with his late perturbed manner. Once more he was himself, his supremacy of the House, lost through the lamentable exhibition just witnessed, instantly reassumed with his self-command. . . . In half a dozen sentences of exquisitely modulated speech Gladstone . . . played with Lord Randolph, and finally tossing him aside, turned his attention, as he said, to more serious matters.

This was all very well to begin with. But warming with his work, the Premier proceeded through a series of gymnastic exercises which would have left an ordinary man of half his years pale and breathless. Watching him as he brought down his strong right hand with resounding blows upon the Blue Book from which he had just quoted, newcomers to the House understood the fervency with which Disraeli once thanked God that the table intervened between him and his life-long rival. . . . Sometimes with both hands raised above his head; often with left elbow leaning on the table and right hand with closed fist shaken at the head of some unoffending country gentleman on the back benches opposite; anon standing half a step back from the table, with the left hand hanging at his side and the right hand uplifted so that he might with thumb nail lightly touch the shining crown of his head, he trampled his way through the arguments of his adversary as an elephant in an hour of aggravation rages through a jungle.[26]

[25] [James Grant], *The British Senate* (Philadelphia, 1838), II, 55-56.

[26] Henry W. Lucy, *Memories of Eight Parliaments* (London, 1908), pp. 14-15.

In this sketch the vitality of Gladstone's gestures in his later years is apparent, but it is also evident that they were often intimidating rather than persuasive in their effect upon his colleagues.

One other aspect of Gladstone's delivery is worthy of brief mention—the magnetic, almost mesmeric, quality of his eyes. Usually his gaze was direct and rather intense, but in moments of stress his eyes appeared to flash with the fire of his convictions. The story is told of Professor Blackie who, during an argument with Gladstone, "was about to deliver a final and crushing rejoinder when he found, to his astonishment, that the words were frozen on his lips: Gladstone had opened his eyes a shade wider and looked at him. The Professor, on whom this experience had apparently made a great impression, repeated the story so often that it acquired a title among his acquaintances, and was referred to as 'Blackie's peep into Hell.' "[27] Professor Blackie's experience was not accidental. Justin McCarthy, another observer of Gladstone, expressed a commonly held opinion when he wrote, "For many years the eye of Gladstone dominated the House of Commons. There was no escaping from it. The youngest and most obscure member of the House who ventured to interrupt, though merely by a question or a word from the most distant seat, the speech of the great orator, found the burning eye turned upon him at once, and the overwhelming answer poured out upon him."[28]

In maintaining direct and personal contact with his listeners, Gladstone was aided by his method of speech preparation. Though he did write his speeches out in the Oxford Union and later delivered many addresses, lectures, and papers from manuscript, his usual practice was to sketch a simple outline of his thoughts in the form of topical words or phrases on sheets or slips of paper. While sitting in the House he would add to these, rearrange, or otherwise revise them until the moment of delivery and often while he was speaking as well.[29] The number of notes, of course, varied with the importance or length of the speech; but invariably Gladstone used them merely as a general guide to his remarks, preferring to expand upon them as he talked. He was thus completely independent of a manuscript and relied directly upon his unfailing fluency and memory to provide the words. This accretive, extemporaneous method of speech preparation left him free to establish close physical communication with his audience and to take full advantage of the various features of his delivery.

The qualities of Gladstone's delivery described here were the product of many years of growth and experience in the House. Though his maiden speech, in 1833, was well received,[30] his delivery for many years was described as subdued, student-like, and characterized by "a kind of gentle languor and melancholy."[31] He delivered many notable speeches in Commons during his first thirty years there, but it was probably not until his own first administration,

[27] Desmond MacCarthy, "The G.O.M.," *The New Statesman*, VIII (1917), 423.

[28] Justin McCarthy, "William Ewart Gladstone," *The Forum*, XXV (1898), 513-514.

[29] For a sample of Gladstone's notes, see Loren Reid, "Gladstone's Theory of Parliamentary Debating," *Bulletin of the Debating Association of the Pennsylvania Colleges*, XX, No. 24 (1945), 4-5.

[30] On June 3, 1833, Gladstone defended his father against the charge of cruelty to the slaves on his Demerara plantations in the West Indies. He received congratulations from the Whig Colonial Secretary, Lord Stanley, and from Sir Robert Peel.

[31] F. A., "William Ewart Gladstone," *London Society*, XV (1869), 98.

1868-1874, that he reached his full maturity as a speaker.

To this account of Gladstone's qualities as a speaker should be added something of the personality and character which gave him status as a parliamentary orator, especially in the view of large sections of the middle classes. First among his personal qualities was his unflagging energy and industry in behalf of any cause he undertook. Thus, so great was the spate of legislation which he got through Parliament during his first administration, some of it involving detail over which only he and a few others are said to have had complete command, that he exhausted his colleagues and practically legislated himself out of office by the middle of 1873. Three years later, stimulated into activity by the Bulgarian massacres of 1876, he fought against Disraeli's Near Eastern policies until his eventual, final victory over his great rival in 1880.

Allied to Gladstone's capacity for sustained work was his courage. In 1868, after declaring that his mission was to pacify Ireland, he embarked upon his ambitious program of Irish land, Church, and educational reforms which ended in his first great defeat over the question of home rule in 1886. This defeat was the only time his colleagues reported him crushed by failure.[32] Seven years later, he tried again to effect a final settlement of the Irish question. Though he was defeated by the House of Lords as well as by events beyond his control, he did succeed in getting his second Home Rule Bill through the House of Commons by a safe majority of forty votes.

Underlying Gladstone's industry and his courage was his belief in principles. Complicated and devious as his reasoning often was, he tended to translate all issues into basic Christian doctrine. In Midlothian in 1879, the issue he raised was that of justice and liberty for peoples oppressed by imperialism. In domestic affairs, he made much of the virtues of frugality and responsible management of personal and national interests. He often disregarded necessity and expediency, seeking always apparently for ultimate moral good. This practice was of considerable value to him as a speaker, for while his audiences outside the House could not appreciate the practical complications of political events, they could understand his essential appeals to the welfare of mankind at home and abroad, to change and progress by means of orderly government rather than by violence and revolution, and to the advantage of the peaceful settlement of disputes over war and aggression.

To Gladstone's belief in principles was joined another quality that also appealed to the nineteenth-century middle classes. This was his lifelong religious fervor. Though many considered him far too tolerant of Roman Catholicism, his loyalty to the Church of England was never seriously doubted. In his private life he was known for his piety and charity. He not only gave away a considerable part of his fortune but, even as Prime Minister, continued his nocturnal activities on behalf of London prostitutes at great risk to his personal reputation and public career. No man in public office could have survived so unwise and questionable an activity had he not been, in his own life, above reproach. Throughout his life he revealed his firm faith in the teachings of Christianity as the measure of human conduct. Great masses of people believed that Gladstone's strength was as

[32] Sir Wemyss Reid, ed., *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (London, 1899), p. 51.

the strength of ten because his heart was pure.

Finally, among the major characteristics that were of value to Gladstone as a speaker were his earnestness and sincerity. He was not addicted to levity or to humor. He conducted himself in public with a seriousness approaching austerity. He seemed always to have some purpose in view. The emotion he displayed while speaking was that of a man who believed completely in what he said and was anxious to persuade others to his opinion. It was these qualities which gave to his delivery the dignity which it needed to balance the enthusiasm of his voice and gesture.

Of course, in the minds of those who hated and despised him, the personal characteristics that have been described here took on a different hue. To such persons his courage was a sign of hardheadedness and obstinacy; his industry was opportunism at work; his religiousness was too much overdone to be completely genuine; and his love of principle was a convenient method of escaping from the harsh realities of political situations. They thought him quixotic and uncertain in his policies, longwinded and hopelessly involved in his speaking, domineering and self-centered in political action, and, in his later years, a contentious old man who sought to impose his will upon Parliament and the nation. Though there was some truth in what his more bitter antagonists thought of him, their opinions were the inevitable consequence of a long and extremely active political life, of a personality that defied simple analysis, and of a mode of speaking which was suspect in its fluency as well as in the complicated structure of its language.

His contemporaries often spoke of Gladstone as the last representative of the golden age of oratory of the preceding century. Sir Edward Hamilton wrote that "the feeling that ran through the House when he was speaking was that he was the sole surviving representative of a school of oratory which had died out and was not likely to revive."[33] Ernest Beckett called him "the last surviving master of the grand style of Parliamentary eloquence."[34] But Gladstone's resemblance to Chatham, Pitt, Fox, and Canning was superficial. He was one of the last speakers in the House to use Latin quotations frequently. For many years, too, he wore clothes of the style that had been popular in his youth. His flowing coats, the high, pointed collars suggestive of the neck-cloth of the eighteenth-century, and the loosely-bowed tie were all reminiscent of a former day. But more than either his Latin or his dress, his delivery appeared to his contemporaries to be in the grand tradition of the age of Burke and Pitt. The magnificent voice, the large and graceful gestures, the smooth and never-failing flow of language all made comparison with masters of the past inevitable. W. T. Stead, while admitting Gladstone's sophistry, spoke of his great dramatic power and declared him superior even to Burke as an orator and as a debater in his grasp of principle and management of detail.[35] C. H. Hill, in 1880, wrote that Gladstone had had no equal since Fox, Pitt, and Brougham.[36] H. T. Peck, on the other hand, predicted that Gladstone will live forever for his parliamentary skill, for his mastery of finance, his pure character, urbanity, courtesy to opponents, and as the last of an earlier school of states-

[33] Sir Edward Hamilton, *Mr. Gladstone* (New York, 1898), p. 12.

[34] Ernest Beckett, "Gladstone as a Parliamentarian," *Saturday Review*, LXXXV (1898), 705.

[35] W. T. Stead, "Gladstone, A Character Sketch," *Review of Reviews*, V (1892), 447.

[36] C. H. Hill, "Mr. Gladstone," *International Review*, VIII (1880), 338.

men who brought to Parliament the dignity and intellectual grace of the two Universities, but that he would not be ranked with Burke, Chatham, Pitt, or even Beaconsfield as an orator.[37] William O'Connor Morris, in a review of Morley's *Life* in 1903, agreed that Gladstone was not an orator of the first rank because his speeches were often confused and verbose, disfigured by sophistry, duplicity, and quibbling; but he named him the greatest debater of the day, skilfull in argument and in his mastery of details, passionately earnest, and adept in reasoning out questions.[38]

In his rhetoric Gladstone was "to an extraordinary extent the embodiment of the nineteenth century's ideal of political speaking."[39] His language was voluminous because he was by nature loquacious and expressive. The political and social conditions of the century offered him unlimited opportunity to speak. In the Parliaments in which he served, the House of Commons and the executive became the leading organs of government. Gladstone, himself, was prominent among those who helped Commons gain ascendency over the House of Lords. The press of legislation of the widest possible variety was heavy throughout his lifetime. Parliamentary debate became the chief method for the resolution of national problems. The revolts and popular uprisings of the early years of the century yielded in the middle decades to organized and peaceful pressure upon Parliament as the chief means of effecting needed reforms.

Gladstone's language was parliamentary in tone and structure not only because he lent himself fully to the rhetorical customs of Commons, but because the full coverage of parliamentary debates by the press made necessary the use of formalized, cautious, "official" language. The individuality and informality that had characterized the House in the previous century gave way in the nineteenth to an increased reliance upon formalities of procedure and discussion.

In the totality of Gladstone's rhetoric may be seen the emphasis which the nineteenth century placed upon the character of the political speaker. In him, the respectability, the morality, and the industry of the century were epitomized. In his delivery the power of a vigorous and dynamic presentation combined with the *ethos* of the speaker to overcome a style of utterance whose weaknesses were apparent to all.

To his last day in Commons Gladstone played the role of the dedicated parliamentary debater which he had assumed so many years before. On March 1, 1894, he briefly announced his resignation to his Cabinet. Later that day, in the House, he made a pointed attack on the House of Lords for its position on the Parish Councils Bill. The important issue, he said, was not the present Bill but the question of the differences between the House of Lords and the House of Commons, differences which sooner or later would have to be resolved. He made no reference to his resignation and there were only a few members in the House who knew that this was his final speech in Parliament. He had, at last, found his way out of politics which, he wrote, are "'like a labyrinth, from the inner intricacies of which it is even more difficult to find the way of escape, than it was to find the way into them.'"[40]

[37] H. T. Peck, "A Note on Mr. Gladstone," *The Bookman*, VII (1898), 393.

[38] William O'Connor Morris, "The Life of William Ewart Gladstone," *Fortnightly Review*, LXXX (1903), 972.

[39] Osbert Burdett, *W. E. Gladstone* (New York, [1927]), p. 301.

[40] Morley, III, 506.

YUCCA IN THE PAINTED DESERT: NOTES ON THE NEW YORK THEATRE, 1957-1958

Alan S. Downer

THE yucca, any Californian will tell you, is his state flower, but it might well be preempted by the Broadway theatre. You come upon it, unexpectedly, scattered sparsely and at random over a landscape frequently barren or occasionally colored in lurid shades by the decay of some ancient mineral. In bloom, it is spectacular, perfect in form and detail, delicate in shading, the triumphant end product of perhaps two years of concentrated effort during which all the resources of the individual plant were bent upon producing one single, glorious blossom. And then, its end attained, it dies, never to bloom again, and leaving only a blackened stalk to mark the spot in the desert where once life had asserted its full beauty.

Like the yucca, the professional theatre in America is so constituted that each new production is a separate corporate effort, a special combination of producer, backers, playwright, actors, and craftsmen brought together for the sole purpose of bringing into profitable life a particular playscript. Granted that this procedure is, as frequently noted, wasteful of time, of physical and artistic resources, it may well be the major factor in the continuing high quality, the secure professionalism, of the theatre in New York. If every play is a separate corporation, it is also a separate creative effort. Everyone concerned addresses his total efforts to the single end of making the particular play as perfect as talent and craftsmanship can achieve. When the play is worthy, the result is overwhelming. When the play is inferior (and the odds are tremendous that it *will* be inferior), the combination of creative talents and craftsmanship can still produce a satisfying theatrical experience.

The audience, perhaps not improperly, cannot always distinguish the true source of its pleasure. The actor, and less frequently the designer or director, will seem to have "made the play." And sometimes the playwright will receive credit for an achievement to which he has made only a minor contribution. As an instance from the current season: *Look Homeward Angel.* It is a kind of theatrical irony that its original author, Thomas Wolfe, wrote it as a novel only because of the complete frustration of his desire to write it as a play. As an artist he was under some personal compulsion to tell all, to still be talking; and perhaps the first lesson to be learned by an ambitious playwright is when to be silent, and where to stop. Ketti Frings, an old hand at reducing masterpieces to order for the films, rendered the moby-dickensian tale into a neat, one-pound package for the stream-lined consumer. As an experienced workman she went at it in workmanlike fashion. First find your theme: The boy grows up and breaks away. If

Mr. Downer, Professor of English at Princeton, is chairman of the American Society for Theatre Research. The most recent of his books on the drama, The Art of the Play, *appeared in 1956. This is the second of his annual discussions of the Broadway season written for* QJS.

the theme was hardly novel, it was substantial, and its ability to interest an audience has been thoroughly demonstrated in the history of American popular theatre. The theme chosen, two elements must be decided upon; what he will grow up and break away from, and what will be the catalytic agent. Mrs. Frings made her decision with a sure hand. The boy would break away from his mother and the house which symbolized her power over him (*cf.*, *The Silver Cord*), and the agent would be another woman (instances too frequent for citation). In the course of "ordering the action," the characters must be tidied up. The mother becomes a shrewish, miserly tyrant, the boy becomes the awkward adolescent we have known at least from the days of Andy Hardy, and the catalytic agent takes him to bed with her. The audience can understand these things without difficulty; they are as familiar as the Bible used to be. But the enthusiasm of the audience at *Look Homeward Angel* was of the kind reserved for something novel, fresh, newly exciting.

Much of this excitement came not from the play but from the production. First from the designer, Jo Mielziner, who has been for many years one of the uniquely creative forces in our theatre. For the exterior scenes of the play he designed a recognizable boarding house with mansard roof and turrets and bracketed piazza, of the style once described as McKinley Stinker. To this he added an inner stage on a turntable to present the various bedrooms in which important scenes were always taking place. The wings of the house were of scrim, which could be lighted to reveal the stairways and hallways inside, without the adapter having planned it that way. It became possible for a scene played stage center in the lights to acquire multiple significance by allowing the audience to see dimly an off-stage character, who will (or might) be affected by the on-stage action, moving all un-witting towards the inevitable future. Thus the play achieved a depth, a texture, a dimension that counteracted the playwright's tidy digest, and approached—in the best possible way of the theatre—the complexity of verisimilitude that Wolfe aimed at but would never achieve on the stage.

Look Homeward Angel is only a single example of a frequent occurrence on Broadway, for audiences can be as readily moved by some aspect of the craftmanship of production as by the original work of the playwright. Nor is this to be deplored, since there will not be many masterpieces available to any theatrical generation. To be sure the craftsmen must have something to work on. This same Jo Mielziner and a director of triumphant reputation, José Quintero, were set to work on a new play by Carson McCullers, affectionately remembered for *her* play about adolescence, *Member of the Wedding*.

Few people will remember *The Square Root of Wonderful* with anything but distaste. Mrs. McCullers presented her audience with a young divorcee, in love with a worthy young artist but unable to forget the good times—the good bedtimes, to be blunt about it—provided by her otherwise worthless, indeed vicious, ex-husband. The eternal triangle has been triangulating so long in the modern theatre that most of the points have been worn off, and it takes more than a flood of clinical talk about sex to sharpen it up. But that was about all Mrs. McCullers had to offer and the audience was vastly bored. All the craftsmen in the world could not keep the play alive, and it

deserved every bit of the oblivion into which it rapidly slipped.

The 1957-1958 season in New York promised very little. Of the American playwrights who had in past seasons provided something more than an evening's pastime, only William Inge and Tennessee Williams were represented. Maxwell Anderson wasted his talents on a trivial adaptation; Arthur Miller, Elmer Rice, S. N. Behrman, Sidney Kingsley were closeted with their typewriters preparing for the year ahead. But in the mysterious and self-renewing way of the theatre, the absent Old Hands were replaced by New, some from the green pastures of television, some from the withering fields of Hollywood. Whatever their training ground, they are at the moment skillful craftsmen rather than important creative artists, but craftsmanship is the gateway to true creation.

And they are craftsmen of our time, not of Pinero's. Following the practice of our masters they have constructed a new kind of well-made-play which turns, not on the inexorable logic of events, or on the demonstration of some contemporary eternal truth, but on the logic of character seen with sympathy and understanding. *Sunrise at Campobello, Two for the Seesaw, Blue Jeans* are character plays; it might be more precise to call them personality plays, for their power to hold an audience lies in the detailed examination of characters in a commonly shared circumstance. You have only to compare *Blue Jeans*, as it looks with almost Chekhovian objectivity upon the barrier between generations, with its nineteenth-century namesake, full of stereotyped comedy and a melodramatic sawmill, to be reminded of the revolution in popular theatre.

By way of contrast, the moribundity of Pinerotic craftsmanship was conclusively demonstrated by Ray Lawlor's *Summer of the Seventeenth Doll*. A huge success in Australia and in London, it was a quiet failure in New York. The setting was momentarily exotic, with Christmas celebrated with Japanese lanterns and fireworks; the characters were intriguing: two back-country laborers who have for years spent the off-season with two girls in the big city. For one of the girls and one of the men, the ecstatic moment of each year has been a trip to the local fair and the acquisition of a celluloid doll, won by the man and faithfully saved by his lady. But in the summer of the seventeenth doll, both hero and heroine discover that whatever they have in common is as insubstantial as the fairgrounds doll, that by refusing to commit themselves to matrimony, they have turned their summer's pleasure to ashes.

To the American audience, this play could only appear as a kind of museum piece. Novel as its setting might be, it was turned into a museum piece by the plodding conscientiousness of the exposition, the self-conscious symbolism of the doll, and ultimately by the same old theatrical people with the same old theatrical problem. The fable of the grasshopper cannot be made into a fresh illumination by the most skillful craftsmanship.

It is by now apparent that the American audience has little taste for plotting that controls rather than serves character. It is also apparent that mere novelty of theatrical technique will find ready rejection. More and more the audience has come to expect integrated drama and to express its displeasure with any playwright who does not take the theatre with the utmost seriousness. One reason why Anouilh has had such

a hard time staying alive in New York is that he *plays* with the theatre.

The high seriousness of American drama, its preoccupation with character in the contemporary world, is having its effect abroad, most notably where most needed, in England. The triviality of British playwrighting over the past decade has been demonstrated by the apparently endless runs of mechanical farces and mysteries. Theatre-going in London is one-half boredom and one-half passing tea-trays back and forth. Only a season ago the one really exciting performance on Shaftesbury Avenue was the Olivier revival of *Titus Andronicus*. Shakespeare's worst patchwork of apprentice melodrama, three and a half centuries old, had more life, more sense of human truth, than anything the contemporary playwrights had been able to paste up.

But the great success that Arthur Miller and other American playwrights have registered in both public and private theatres in London has not gone unobserved by the younger British talents. In particular, the effect of Miller's dramatic style, the explosiveness of the relationships between characters, the poetic use of the physical theatre, can be clearly seen in two plays by Britain's *wunderkind*, John Osborne. Osborne, of course, does not merely represent a fresh talent in the theatre; he is the dramatic branch of the literary society of Angry Young Men. It cannot be denied that the young men have something to be angry about: "the stagnation, the vicious bureaucracy, the emotional fatigue, the lowest gutter-press of all time, the rigid petty snobbery and hopeless jingoism."

It has yet to be proved that anger can create enduring drama, or that the audiences' ears will not be ultimately deafened by the whining, the complaining, the bitter or cynical voice of unrelenting protest. But there is no denying that the angry young playwright wrought havoc among the potted palms and practicable doors of the drawing rooms and bed chamber settings around Piccadilly Circus. The stormy reaction to his plays in the audience and the street and the press almost made the distant observer hope that the English theatre was standing on the verge of another Shavian revolution. The violence of the reaction recalled the satisfaction with which Gerhart Hauptmann regarded the riot that attended the premiere of *Before Sunrise*: "Imagine," he exclaimed. "People *fighting* over a question of art!"

Osborne's two plays arrived on Broadway during the current season. *Look Back in Anger* was greeted with general enthusiasm; perhaps the critics were relieved to discover that all English playwrights were not Terence Rattigan. *The Entertainer* was greeted with modified approval; the approval was mostly for Lawrence Olivier's performance, the modification proceeded from the realization that what seemed the forgiveable flaws of the beginning writer in *Anger* were really the characteristics of Osborne's talent.

Olivier, after seeing *Anger*, is reported to have promised Osborne to play in his next work. Sir Lawrence is an adventurous, but not a rash, man, and obviously what appealed to him in *Look Back in Anger* was the fat part provided for the central character. The play is the longest occasionally-interrupted monologue since Irving gave up *Hamlet*. Jimmy Porter, the hero, talks and talks and talks. Much of the talk is wonderful; much of the wonder is, upon examination, talk. One of the characters is finally forced to admit that Jimmy has "quite a turn of phrase," an

exaggerated example of British understatement.

There is a certain fascination in watching Jimmy's attempts to keep something going (if it is only noise), to irritate his friends into action (if it is only a quarrel)—to create some semblance of life in his depressing suburban flat, in his dull provincial breadwinning. Lady Gregory said of the squabbling paupers in her *Workhouse Ward* that they are a symbol of Ireland: "It is better to be quarreling than to be lonesome." But the *Workhouse Ward* is a one-act play; *Anger* is an unrelenting three-acter. However much the audience may come to sympathize with Jimmy Porter, however much they may recognize in him a true symbol of his whole English generation, by the time the play is half an evening old, he has become a bore. Osborne is certainly concerned with creating exactly the symbol the audience can recognize in Jimmy, but his success is static, not dramatic. Fictional bores are interesting only when they are, like the old spinster in *Emma,* a part of a larger whole. Jimmy Porter is the whole show.

Osborne's difficulty is in finding an action that is equally symbolic and dramatically intriguing. What happens to Jimmy is the kind of O. Henry convention that Williams turned to in *Summer and Smoke,* the gift-of-the-magi switch. The wife whom Jimmy nags in Acts One and Two is replaced by a mistress whom he nags in Act Three, who is again replaced by the wife whom he will continue to nag after the audience has gone home. That is all, and that is very little: it is a symbol of Jimmy's life, the futile circle of *The Lower Depths,* without the variety of characters and situations that enables Gorki's play to hold the attention. The spectator gets the impression that the whole play is Jimmy talking, and when the talk has gone on so long that even Osborne cannot take any more, something violent happens—a wrestling match, a slap and a tickle. Osborne began his career as an actor, and this playwright's trick is derived from the standard practice of the typical English actor. When things get dull, he bellows. *Anger* is certainly a work of promise and freshness in British dramaturgy, but it is far short of an achievement.

The Entertainer underlines the flaws of *Anger.* Here too Osborne's central figure is a symbol: a passé vaudeville actor, carrying on in a tawdry succession of "Empires," with the oldest of crude jokes, the most stereotyped of sentimental and jingoistic songs. And the part is, like Jimmy Porter, a fat one which Olivier performed with the greatest relish. With these two plays, Osborne has declared himself the minstrel of the New Wasteland: Britannia Agonistes; and, as with the older minstrel, the audience cannot fail to see the truth of his observation.

It is a truth that makes excellent material for critical commentary, but it leaves something to be desired as theatrical experience. In place of the O. Henryish plot of *Anger, The Entertainer* utilizes a quick-frozen allegory, in which the characters exist before and aside from the action. On this point Aristotle must be allowed both the first and the last word: Drama is an imitation of an action with a beginning, a middle, and an end. Both Osborne's plays have only a middle, they exhibit but they do not penetrate a central character. The other characters are only, as Shaw said of an Irving production, mutes at his funeral.

Archie, the hero, describes himself and his fellows:

> We're dead beat and down and outs. We're drunks, maniacs, we're crazy, we're bonkers, the whole flaming bunch of us. Why, we have problems that nobody's ever heard of, we're characters out of something that nobody believes in. We're something that people make jokes about, because we're so remote from the rest of ordinary everyday, human experience. But we're not really funny. We're too boring.

There is truth in Archie's words, and it is a truth that does not make for satisfying theatre, however much it may characterize an entire society.

After some eighteen years of theatrical silence, William Saroyan returned to Broadway with *The Cave Dwellers*. Like Osborne he is using the theatre for allegorical purposes. Saroyan's theatre, however, is part of a slum-clearance project and is about to be torn down; for Osborne this would be the denouement devoutly to be wished, for Saroyan it is at least pathos, if not tragedy. So long as his theatre stands it furnishes a hiding place for a strange collection of failures: an ex-pugilist, a former clown (The King), a former leading lady (The Queen), a trainer and his bear, a talentless, tongue-tied ingenue. They are held together and kept alive by Love, which has always been Old Doc Saroyan's panacea, and though they starve and steal and have nightmares, they do all these things with such nobility and sentimentality that the audience is almost taken in to admiration, in spite of the hackneyed ideas, the slovenly craftsmanship, and the patent meaning of the allegory.

The allegory, that is, is patent to the audience, but the author may be so full of love that he cannot see what he has written about. The Theatre (The Globe!) is about to be wrecked *for cause*: slums must be done away with if life is to be better, and these actors though noble in their own view are incompetent phonies in the modern world. If it is regrettable that the noble phoney, the useless and dangerously decayed building must be eliminated, it is perhaps wiser to be guided by the example of Nature than nostalgia for the ruins of the past.

Saroyan reveals that the play was written in the Great Northern Hotel in eight days. He is a little disappointed in himself and in the hotel because it was there that he wrote *The Time of Your Life* in six. *The Cave Dwellers* is a series of vignettes turning on the proposition that Love is all in all; everything is Love, from delivering dairy products, to bearbaiting. And most of all the theatre is Love. The playwright's business, he declares, is to choose Love not Hate, implying that Love makes good art possible, though his definition of Love is somewhat obscure. "Love," he says, "is getting along into another day, getting to work, whatever your work may be." The theme of the play, then, is Love. And *The Cave Dwellers* is a play, he tells us, because it is written. This must be the world's worst attempt at defining drama. And he accompanies the definition with most dangerous advice to novice playwrights: "before beginning to write . . . place paper in the typewriter." This is a direct encouragement to the hit-or-miss craftsmanship so ably revealed in *The Cave Dwellers* and ignores the hard sweat and long planning that should precede the finality of committing words to the typewritten page.

Walter Kerr remarked that Saroyan isn't listening very much these days. Had he listened more closely he would have heard a great deal about Love, but hardly anything as simple as his constant reiterations.

Tennessee Williams, for instance, continued his career as America's most

successful author of Gothic nightmares with a long one-act play, *Suddenly Last Summer,* and this too was about Love and may be read as an allegory. But this love leads to destruction, the destruction of a man, a poet. Williams decided to have the play performed "off Broadway" to escape the critical attacks and audience indifference that greeted *Orpheus Descending.* But the production was not very *far* "off Broadway," in a comfortable theatre, with the best talent Broadway had to offer, and at comparable prices. The major characters are a young girl who has seen a horrible sight and a domineering old woman who refuses to let her speak about it or describe it. The old woman had created an artificial and sterile life for her son; the young woman had helped him break away; the result was his death. (Is this possibly an allegory about Tennessee Williams who has looked upon life and found it hateful, but is not permitted to speak the truth by organized theatre-goers?)

The son wanted to be a poet, but his mother's nurturing had made him shy of crowds. So he took the young girl on a vacation trip and dressed her in a sensational bathing suit. This brought the crowds, and the poet was able to talk to them, and give them things, such things that they desired more, until he became frightened of their greedy appetites and tried to run away. Only to be devoured, literally, before the young lady's eyes. (Is this possibly an allegory about Tennessee Williams, and what he has called "The Catastrophe of Success" that came upon him with the naked exposure of Blanche Dubois?) Read allegorically, *Suddenly Last Summer* might be called Williams' *An Enemy of the People,* an artistic autobiography, without the ironic objectivity that Ibsen achieves.

There is allegory in another off Broadway premiere, Samuel Beckett's *Endgame.* Beckett's earlier play, *Waiting for Godot,* was fun, though it could mean very little since o is the least possible of all symbols for the creation of a dramatic action. But *Godot* was dressed up in music hall turns, comic irrelevancies, and Bert Lahr (who openly confessed that he had not the slightest notion why he was doing what he was doing). *Endgame* is minus o. The characters are confined within an almost windowless room. One is a blind man in a wheel-chair; an old man and woman live in ashcans. The only mobile character is a servant who wheels the chair about, feeds dog biscuits to the ashcan-dwellers, and occasionally climbs a ladder, looks out the window, and announces that things are even worse out there.

Sometime around 1920 in Paris there was a place for this sort of empty nonsense. But at these prices (to speak in the current fashion, symbolically) it is too dearly bought.

The brightest evening off Broadway as far as new plays were concerned was furnished by the American debut of Marcel Aymé's *Clerambard.* Like his fellows in the ghetto below Times Square, Aymé plays fast and loose with morality, with religion, with accepted values, but he plays in terms of people and action not symbols and statues. Clerambard is a decayed aristocrat who forces himself and his family to spend all their waking hours at menial labor to raise funds to preserve the family castle. The aristocrat is consequently bad tempered and so full of hate that he kills a dog out of sheer malevolence. (How simple to allegorize this into post-war France! But not M. Aymé.) Enter St. Francis of Assisi, who presents the aristocrat with a copy of his familiar

textbook. Whereupon the dog revives and Clerambard reverses his character completely. Whatever he has he gives to the poor; he berates his wife for killing a poisonous spider; he decides to marry his son to a prostitute (on the principle that the worthiest are those who debase themselves most); he plans to sell his castle, pay off his debts, give anything left over to charity, and then go beg—in order to bring out the best in his fellow men. The family in alarm summons a doctor and a priest, both of whom argue with this man of too much faith. Then the miracle of the dog is discovered to have been a mistake.

In a conventional play, the revelation would instantly bring Clerambard to his senses and the audience would see him once again the slave-driver sweating over the preservation of his ancestral home. But the conventional switch, like allegory, is not for M. Aymé. Faith has got its hooks into the hero, and he goes off with his family in pursuit of charity. The priest has the last and the significant word: "The transports of faith and charity are full of glory, but I would like to know what will become of them in a month." A quizzical view of love, even the higher love, is to be expected from the French; it is particularly welcome as a counteragent to Mr. Saroyan's naiveté, Mr. Osborne's affectionate contemplation of his own navel, or Beckett's empty bucket.

An interesting aspect of the current season was the first appearance on the stage of two of the continuing attempts to revive poetic drama by poets who believe that verse is the principal ingredient demanded. One was Christopher Fry's long delayed *The Firstborn*, the story of Moses and the exodus of the Children of Israel. The immediately observable trouble with the play, as so often with Fry and poets in general, is that it is all poetry and no drama. Much of it is deliciously quotable:

> Happiness is sometimes hard to recognize
> It seems so to keep company with the unlikely.
>
> Statesmanship is the gods' gift to restrain their own Infidelities to man.
>
> The reasonable is the invention of man,
> Altogether in opposition to the facts of creation.

But in the context of dramatic action there should be little opportunity to savor the complexities of such witty rephrasing of common cynicism. There *is* time in comedy, of course, and that is why Fry's one success with the full-length play is *The Lady's Not for Burning*, where the people and the passions matter less than the ideas. *The Firstborn* purports to be, if not tragedy, drama of heroic stature, peopled with Moses and Aaron and Pharaoh and his family and equipped with plagues (seven in one speech) and mighty decisions and God ("The eternal eavesdropper"). The characters and the situations, mighty though they be, are trapped in a web of language which the actors delivered in the most significant manner, until the significance of the whole became totally obscure.

In sharp contrast to Fry at almost every point is *J.B.*, the new drama by Archibald MacLeish. MacLeish has been the most serious of all American poets in his occasional pursuit of the theatre. In *J.B.* he retells the story of Job, but Job is not decked out in oriental costume, false beard, and the kind of stilt walking that seems to pass for acting in historical dramas of religious import. MacLeish's Job is a modern New Englander, or perhaps a modern American, the successful go-getter who justifies his success by saying that God is on his side. Then one by one his possessions are removed: one son killed in a meaningless military action,

another in an auto accident; one daughter killed by a moronic rapist, another by a falling wall; his despairing wife leaves him, telling him to curse God. But nothing shakes Job's faith, not even the worldly comforters who come to advise him: a soap box radical, a radio priest, an analyst. He clings to his faith until God relents and Job goes on, as he must in a world of accident and meaningless catastrophe. In such a world man has only himself—not to blame, but to bloom.

There are many things in the play beside the theme to remind the spectator of *The Skin of Our Teelth,* in particular the emphasis on endurance and the necessity for survival whatever the odds. But as Wilder made use of a theatre-parody as a presentational device, MacLeish frames the story of Job with a surrounding action involving two circus vendors, Mr. Zuss and Mr. Nickles, who assume the roles of God and Devil, and command and comment on the main action. While this might have the detrimental effect of taking the main action one step further from the spectator, the playwright has been at some pains to remove both God and Devil before the resolution. The final scene will long remain in the heart and mind of the spectator as Job and his wife, both begin to set to rights the rubble of their home and walk towards the white light blazing at their front door:

> The candles in churches are out.
> The lights have gone out in the sky.
> Blow on the coal of the heart
> and we'll see by and by. . . .

If this final dramatic image reminds the experienced theatregoer of the cowboy and his girl riding off into the sunset, it may also evoke a memory of Chaplin hitching off up the road alone, the vagabond without a guidebook whose dignity and enduring importance lie in his truth as an image of the journey of modern man.

In his first play, *Come Back, Little Sheba,* William Inge was concerned with this same theme, and his hero's declaration, "We gotta keep goin'—somehow," if it lacks the poetic suggestiveness of MacLeish's statement, speaks directly and with the ring of truth to the audience. In his fourth play, *The Dark at the Top of the Stairs,* Inge has discovered an image which his audience can also immediately recognize as true: a long stairway leading to a darkened upper hall, and a little boy who is afraid to climb it alone. Each of the characters in the play has his stairway, and each is afraid, and each must climb. Some of them fail, and fall back into a more fearsome darkness. Some of them pretend to have made the upper hall, but the emptiness of their lives reveals their failure. But the audience is mainly concerned with the little boy and his immediate family, and they all make it. There is nothing much up there, of course, except the conquest of a symbol, but this is clearly a case where the symbolic act has greater significance for both actor and audience than the literal act could ever have.

Inge has said that his plays do not have "themes," but it is difficult not to see in each of them a unifying idea or central concern as the hub of the action. *The Dark at the Top of the Stairs* is about fear, the peculiarly modern fear of commitment, of self-surrender.

Ruben, a footloose ex-cowboy, uses his job as travelling salesman to run away from the family he deeply loves. His brother-in-law, Morris, seeks refuge in his inner thoughts from an unsuccessful but bravely tolerated marriage. Ruben's shy daughter hides at the piano, playing Chopin; his son wants

only to collect the photographs of movie stars. Perhaps this sounds over-tidy, undramatic, as if Inge were simply revolving a cut stone in his fingers and letting the audience see one facet after another of the same thing.

But in Chekhovian fashion, he introduces into this static group an alien force. This is a young Jewish cadet from a nearby military school who is to be the daughter's blind date at a social affair, and he is a character drawn with great warmth and sensitivity. The daughter's timidity leads her to desert her escort at a moment when he cannot defend himself against a brutal attack. The shocking discovery, next day, that the boy has committed suicide is strong enough to set off a chain reaction as character after character faces his fear and discovers the possibility of commitment. Their commitment is not to anything big; they do not get religion or seize the torch of moral rearmament or civic or political virtue. They simply do what has to be done, recognize that in self-surrender there is no loss of the individual's "respect," his "dignity." It is part of the reality of Inge's work that the audience can recognize, not just the truth of the characters and their situations, but the possibility and truth of the resolutions he advances.

It is in this sense that Ruben and his family, like the Doc of *Little Sheba* or the cowboy of *Bus Stop*, or MacLeish's Job, are valid dramatic images for the audience of the contemporary theatre. The historically minded may regret that they are not so deep as Oedipus, nor so wide as King Lear—but they will serve, they do serve. And like the greater heroes, the larger myths of the past, they ennoble and enrich contemporary life and serve to encourage the audience—common men like themselves—in the sometimes tawdry, sometimes resplendent, sometimes dark theatre in which all must play out their parts.

* * *

HUGH BLAIR'S THEORY OF TASTE

Herman Cohen

HUGH BLAIR begins his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* with material which is common to both speaking and writing. These opening lectures concern taste and style. In terms of his announced conception of rhetoric, Blair's examination of taste and style is designed for three groups of readers: those who aspire to proficiency in speaking; those who would improve their literary powers; and those who merely wish to improve their critical judgment of literature and rhetoric.[1] Only when he comes to treat of eloquence and literature as separate disciplines does Blair draw a distinction in terms of the criteria which are to be utilized in evaluating each species of art.

Blair was alone in his time in discussing taste as a part of rhetoric. Campbell ignored the aesthetic aspects of the art, as did Whately. Only Blair, among contemporary British rhetorical theorists, undertook to investigate the manner in which a listener may judge the merits and faults of a discourse. While his theories were not notably unique, Blair's exposition of his concept of taste marked one of the first times in which such a system had been applied to oral discourse. Kames had concerned himself with taste to a greater degree than had Blair, but his treatment was not directed to the art of speechmaking as such. We can say, therefore, that while Hugh Blair's theories are derivative of the philosophies of his time, his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* was the first British work in which these ideas were applied to oral communication.

The treatment of taste is in direct contrast to much of the later material in his work. In the more didactic sections of the *Lectures,* Blair is largely concerned with the formulation of rules and suggestions. The lectures on taste, however, represent a speculative inquiry into the nature of that faculty which "enables men to judge and judge well." Instead of a series of rules, Blair's theory of taste emerges as a few rather generalized principles.

It is Blair's hope that an understanding of these principles will enable his readers to become more competent judges of the speeches they hear. They are expected to relate the general considerations of taste to the more specific attributes of rhetoric which are treated in the later portion of the lectures. An understanding of the principles of taste will allow the critic to apply them to such factors as style, organization, and delivery as well as to the speech as a complete work.

Although much of Blair's rhetorical theory is firmly rooted in the classicists, his theory of taste is essentially that of the eighteenth-century School of Taste which held that taste was an innate but precisely improvable talent. The same general point of view as Blair's is presented by such critics and theorists as Francis Hutchison, David Hartley, William Shenstone, Archibald Allison, and

Mr. Cohen (Ph.D., State University of Iowa, 1954) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Oregon.

1 Hugh Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (Philadelphia, 1833), p. 11.

Erasmus Darwin. In particular Blair's concept of taste seems most closely related to the writings of his contemporaries Sir Joshua Reynolds and Edmund Burke and his friends Lord Kames and David Hume. It is not surprising that Kames' influence is particularly pervasive in Blair's remarks on taste. Much that Blair had to say seems to have been derived from conversations with Kames, at whose instigation he had begun the lectures.[2]

Blair divides his discussion of taste into five distinct but complementary areas of inquiry. Of their division, he says,

> I shall first explain the Nature of Taste as a power or faculty in the human mind. I shall next consider how far it is an improvable faculty. I shall show the sources of its improvement, and the Characters of Taste in its most perfect state. I shall then examine the various fluctuations to which it is liable, and inquire whether there be any standard to which we can bring the different tastes, in order to distinguish the corrupted from the true.[3]

Blair begins his analysis by defining taste as "the power of receiving pleasure from the beauties of nature and art." It is quite clear that he considers taste to be a receptive or critical power rather than a creative faculty.

This common-sense definition of taste in no way represents a departure from established neo-classical critical thought. In one way or another, the same definition had been propounded by rhetorical and critical writers of the period. Blair's definition in its essentials is particularly close to that presented by Edmund Burke, who defined taste as "that faculty or faculties of the mind, which are affected with, or which form a judgment of, the works of imagination and the elegant arts."[4] The only significant difference between the two definitions is that Blair substitutes "nature" for Burke's "imagination" as the medium for taste.

As in much of his writing on rhetoric, Blair is concerned with the relationship between nature and art in determining the characteristics of taste. In order to discuss taste systematically and formulate any intelligible standard for its use, it is first necessary to decide whether the faculty is to be considered as an internal sense or as an exertion of reason. If one accepts Blair's assumption that reason is "that power of the mind which in speculative matters discovers truth, and in practical matters judges of the fitness of means to an end," the question is not difficult to answer. It is obvious, Blair argues, that the mind does not receive pleasure through the discovery of the understanding or the deduction of an argument. Pleasure will often strike, in the same manner, at persons of varying mental development and abilities. Hence, taste seems more closely allied to a feeling or sense than to a process of the mind. Although he believes that taste is ultimately founded on a certain natural and instinctive sensibility to beauty, Blair is careful to point out that reason is not entirely excluded from its exertions. Reason, while it does not create taste, does assist in its operation and serves to enlarge its power. Blair's postulate in regard to the innate nature of taste is closely related to the concept of Lord Kames, but it differs rather sharply from the more rationalistic attitudes of other contemporary writers, who had assigned a somewhat more significant role to reason than had Blair or Kames. Kames, for example, had

[2] Helen Randall, *The Critical Theory of Lord Kames* (Northampton, Massachusetts, 1941), p. 82.

[3] Blair, p. 16.

[4] Edmund Burke, *On the Sublime and Beautiful* (New York, 1885), p. 5.

written, "Our taste is not accidental, but uniform and universal, making a branch of our nature."[5] David Hume, in contrast, had drawn a clear distinction between the functions of taste and of reason:

> Reason conveys the knowledge of truth and falsehood; taste gives the sentiment of beauty and deformity, vice and virtue. The one discloses objects without addition or dimunition: the other has a productive faculty; and gilding or staining all natural objects with the colours, borrowed from the internal sentiment, raises, in a manner a new creation.[6]

Burke had advanced the thesis that taste might well be as rigidly governed by rules as was reason:

> The logic of taste, if I may be allowed the expression, might very possibly be as well digested, and we might come to discuss matters of this nature with as much certainty, as those which seem immediately within the province of mere reason. For if taste has no fixed principles, if the imagination is not affected according to some invariable and certain laws, our labor is like to be employed to very little purpose; as it must be judged an useless if not absurd undertaking to lay down rules for caprice, and to set up for a legislator of whims and fancies.[7]

Sir Joshua Reynolds also argued that taste must be subject to rules and to reason when he wrote:

> It is supposed that their powers are intuitive; that under the name of genius great works are produced, and under the name of taste an exact judgment is given, without our knowing why, and without our being under the least obligation to reason, precept, or experience. One can scarce state these opinions without exposing their absurdity; yet they are constantly in the mouths of men, and particularly of artists.[8]

Since taste is an innate faculty, Blair reasons, it must be common in some degree to all men. Even among the rudest of civilizations and among the young and unlettered there is some appreciation of the beauties of nature and of art. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that it is no less essential to men to have some discernment of beauty than it is to possess the attributes of reason and of speech. In keeping with his conception of the innate nature of taste, Blair feels that there is not an even distribution of the faculty of appreciation. Some men have taste which is coarse, weak, and confused, while others possess a taste which is refined, powerful, and orderly.

Blair seeks out two reasons for the inequalities in taste and in so doing indicates the rational basis of his aesthetic theories. In many cases, inferior or superior taste may be attributed to inherited sensibility. To a much greater extent, however, variations are due to education and culture. Blair's theory thus evolves into the consideration of a faculty which is fundamentally innate but which is subject to great improvement through the operation of environmental factors. In postulating this view of taste as an improvable attribute, Blair's thinking parallels that of other representatives of the School of Taste. Burke had also postulated the innate and improvable character of taste:

> So far, then, as taste belongs to the imagination, its principle is the same in all men; there is no difference in the manner of their being affected, nor in the causes of the affection; but in the *degree* there is a difference, which arises from two causes principally; either from a greater degree of natural sensibility, or from a closer and longer attention to the object.[9]

Hume's view was not far removed from that of his contemporaries:

> Strong sense, united to delicate sentiment, improved by practice, perfected by comparison,

[5] Henry Home, Lord of Kames, *Elements of Criticism* (Edinburgh, 1761), p. 44.

[6] David Hume, *Essays Literary, Moral and Political* (London, 1875), p. 484.

[7] Burke, p. 4.

[8] Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Discourses on Art* (Chicago, 1945), p. 180.

[9] Burke, p. 16.

and cleared of all prejudice can alone entitle critics to this valuable character.[10]

Reynolds in his investigation of taste had discussed the relationship between nature and art in much the same manner as other representatives of the School of Taste:

To form this just taste is undoubtedly in your own power, but it is to reason and philosophy that you must have recourse; from them you must borrow the balance, by which is to be weighed and estimated the value of every pretension that intrudes itself on your power.[11]

Lord Kames had expressed essentially the same idea when he said:

With respect to the common nature of man in particular, we have a conviction that it is invariable not less than universal. Nor are we deceived: because, giving allowance for the difference of culture and gradual refinement of manners, the fact corresponds on our conviction.[12]

As proof of his assertion, Blair points to the superior taste of civilized nations over barbarous nations and to the superior taste of educated people over the unlettered. The same sort of argument had also been presented by David Hume in his essay *On The Standards of Taste.*

Blair also agrees with Hume and Burke in regard to the means by which innate taste can be improved. Together with these critics he feels that improvement in taste must be predicated on exercise in criticism and reason. Just as in any skill an individual will become more proficient with practice, so he will also become more and more skilled in taste as he exercises that faculty. Blair emphasizes this point of view when he says:

When one is only beginning his acquaintance with works of genius, the sentiment which attends them is obscure and confused. He cannot point out the several excellencies or blemishes of a performance which he peruses; he is at a loss on what to rest his judgment: all that can be expected is, that he should tell in general whether he be pleased or not. But allow him more experience in works of this kind, and his taste becomes by degrees more exact and enlightened. He begins to perceive not only the character of the whole, but the beauties and defects of each part; and is able to describe the peculiar qualities which he praises or blames. The mist dissipates which seemed formerly to hang over the object; and he can at length pronounce firmly and without hesitation concerning it. Thus in taste, considered as mere sensibility, exercise opens a great source of improvement.[13]

Blair's statement in this matter bears a close resemblance to the idea expressed earlier by Hume who had written:

But though there be naturally a wide difference in point of delicacy between one person and another, nothing tends farther to increase and improve this talent, than *practice* in a particular art, and the frequent study or contemplation of a particular species of beauty. . . . So advantageous is practice to the discernment of beauty, that, before we can give judgment on any work of importance, it will even be requisite, that every individual performance be more than once perused by us, and be surveyed in different lights with attention and deliberation.[14]

Burke's point of view was similar to that of Blair and Hume:

It is known that the taste (whatever it is) is improved exactly as we improve our judgment, by extending our knowledge, by a steady attention to our object, and by frequent exercise.[15]

Although taste may be founded ultimately on sensibility, it must not be considered as instinctive sensibility alone. Reason and good sense also have an extensive influence on the operations and decisions of taste. Thus, Blair arrives at his final definition of taste: "a thorough good taste may well be considered as a power compounded of na-

[10] Hume, p. 278.
[11] Reynolds, p. 212.
[12] Kames, p. 298.
[13] Blair, p. 19.
[14] Hume, pp. 274-275.
[15] Burke, p. 22.

tural sensibility to beauty, and of improved understanding." To demonstrate this conclusion, Blair posits the Aristotelian dictum that "the greater part of the productions are no other than imitations of nature; representations of the characters, actions or manners of men." The pleasure which is received from such imitations or representations is founded on mere taste. The judgment, however, of whether such imitations are properly executed is an attribute of the understanding. We are pleased through our own natural sense of beauty, but reason shows us why and upon what grounds we are pleased. A critic whose taste is well developed will not only be able to react favorably or unfavorably but will also be able to recognize when a work is a just representation of nature. Hugh Blair's view of taste, then, is that of a characteristic which is the result of both nature and art. It supposes our natural sense of beauty to be refined by frequent attention to the most beautiful objects, and at the same time to be guided and improved by the light of understanding. In proposing this view of taste, Blair again reflects the general attitude of the School of Taste.

In Blair's judgment, the characteristics of taste, when richly improved, are reducible to two: delicacy and correctness. The former "respects principally the perfection of that natural sensibility on which taste is founded." Delicacy of taste presupposes that a person "feels strongly and feels accurately." Anyone possessing this characteristic is able to see "distinctions and differences where others see none; the most latent beauty does not escape him and he is sensible of the smallest blemish." Correctness, on the other hand, results from the application of understanding to the faculty of taste. Of correctness Blair says:

> A man of correct taste is one who is never imposed on by counterfeit beauties; who carries always in his mind that standard of good sense which he employs in judging of everything. He estimates with propriety the comparative merit of the several beauties which he meets with in any work of genius; refers them to their proper classes; assigns the principles, as far as they can be traced, whence their power of pleasing flows, and is pleased himself precisely in that degree which he ought, and no more.[16]

The two characteristics of taste which Blair proposes reflect the respective roles of nature and art in the theory of taste. Delicacy leans more to feeling and sensibility; correctness, more to reason and judgment. The former is the gift of nature; the latter a product of culture and art. Blair himself confirms this when he says, "The power of delicacy is chiefly seen in discerning the true merit of a work: the power of correctness in rejecting false pretentions to merit." David Hume in formulating his standards of taste had also ascribed delicacy and correctness as two of the essential characteristics of taste:

> Whenever you can ascertain a delicacy of taste, it is sure to meet with approbation; and the best way of ascertaining it is to appeal to those models and principles, which have been established by the uniform consent and experience of nations and ages.[17]

Moreover, a similar division in somewhat different terms had been suggested by Burke, who spoke of "sensibility" and "judgment" rather than delicacy and correctness:

> Whilst we consider taste merely according to its nature and species, we shall find its principles entirely uniform; but the degree in which these principles prevail, in the several individuals of mankind, is altogether as different as the principles themselves are similar. For sensibility and judgement [sic], which are the qualities that compose what we commonly call a *taste*, vary exceedingly in various people.[18]

[16] Blair, p. 21.
[17] Hume, p. 274.
[18] Burke, pp. 18-19.

This division, however, pre-supposes the existence of a criterion or standard to which critics may appeal in distinguishing between good and bad artistic endeavor. Blair recognizes that there must be a standard or else all taste will be equally good. If no standards of taste are to be formulated by which critical judgment is to be made, the critic will be forced to accept the view that "there is no disputing of taste; but that whatever pleases is right and for that reason it does please." Blair rejects this attitude as one which is demonstrably absurd. He asks rhetorically:

> For is there anyone who will seriously maintain that the taste of a Hottentot or a Laplander is as delicate and as correct as that of a Longinus or an Addison? or, that he can be charged with no defect or incapacity who thinks a common newswriter as excellent an historian as Tacitus?[19]

Since it is fallacious to reason in this manner, Blair is led to the conclusion that there must be some foundation for the preference of one man's taste to that of another; and there must be a good and a bad, a right and a wrong, in taste as in other things. Thus there must be some standard of taste to which the critic can appeal in judging a discourse.

The rejection of the notion that individual tastes could not be disputed was by no means original with Blair. Many eighteenth-century critics had predicated their formulation of standards of taste upon similar arguments. Kames at some length had pointed out:

> The proverb [there is no disputing of taste] will hold true as to the particulars now explained; but when applied in general to every subject of taste, the difficulties to be encountered are insuperable. We need only to mention the difficulty that arises from human nature itself. Do we not talk of a good and bad taste?—of a right and a wrong taste?—and upon that supposition do we not censure writers, painters, architects and everyone who deals in the fine arts? Are such criticisms absurd and void of common sense? Have the foregoing expressions, familiar in all languages and among all people, no sort of meaning? This can hardly be; for what is universal, must have a foundation in nature. If we can reach that foundation, the standard of taste will no longer be secret.[20]

Reynolds had written in much the same vein:

> The common saying that *tastes are not to be disputed* owes its influence, and its general reception to the same error which leads us to imagine this faculty of too high an original to submit to the authority of an earthly tribunal. It likewise corresponds with the notions of those who consider it as a mere phantom of the imagination, so devoid of substance as to elude all criticism.[21]

Burke's writings reflected the same attitudes as his contemporaries:

> So that when it is said, taste cannot be disputed, it can only mean, that no one can strictly answer what pleasure or pain some particular man may find from the taste of some particular thing. This indeed cannot be disputed; but we may dispute and with sufficient clearness too, concerning the things which are naturally pleasing or disagreeable to the sense.[22]

In devising the foundations of the standard of taste, Blair carefully indicates that diversity does not necessarily imply corruption. He says, "The tastes of men may differ very considerably as to their object, and yet none of them be wrong." Hence, he points out:

> It is not in matters of taste, as in questions of mere reason, where there is but one conclusion that can be true, and all the rest are erroneous. Truth, which is the object of reason, is one; Beauty, which is the object of taste, is manifold. Taste, therefore, admits of latitude and diversity of objects, in sufficient consistency with goodness or justness of taste.[23]

[19] Blair, p. 22.

[20] Kames, p. 297.
[21] Reynolds, p. 190.
[22] Burke, p. 8.
[23] Blair, pp. 22-23.

Blair, however, recognizes that there is a distinction between diversity and error. Men may disagree as to the comparative merits of two works but, as the Scottish writer explains,

> Where it is with respect to the same object that men disagree, when one condemns that as ugly which another admires as highly beautiful; then it is no longer diversity, but direct opposition of taste that takes place; and therefore one must be in the right, and another in the wrong, unless that absurd paradox were allowed to hold, that all tastes are equally good and true.[24]

While the allowance for diversity and the distinction between diversity and error was rather universal in Blair's time, the concept had received its strongest enunciation in the writings of Hume, who had argued:

> But though this axiom, by passing into a proverb, seems to have attained the sanction of common sense; there is certainly a species of common sense which opposes it, at least seems to modify and restrain it. Whoever would assert an equality of genius and elegance between Ogilby and Milton, or Bunyan and Addison, would be thought to defend no less an extravagance, than if he had maintained a mole hill to be as high as Teneriffe, or a pond as extensive as the ocean. Though there may be found persons who give the preference to the former authors; no one pays attention to such a taste; and we pronounce without scruple the sentiments of these pretended critics to be absurd and ridiculous. The principle of the natural equality of tastes is then totally forgot, and while we admit it on some occasions, where the objects seem near an equality, it appears an extravagant paradox, or rather a palpable absurdity, where objects so disproportionate are compared together.[25]

The standard to which Blair appeals when there is opposition of taste is clear. A standard properly conceived, "signifies that which is of such undoubted authority as to be the test of other things of the same kind." Blair agrees with the Aristotelian point of view that conformity to nature is a principle which can be applied in formulating a standard of taste. In this regard, Blair is fairly close to the point of view held by Reynolds and Kames, although he assigns a somewhat less significant role to the criteria of nature. He feels that nature is only a partial standard and is not completely adequate. He makes his case as follows:

> There is no doubt, that in all cases where an imitation is intended of some object that exists in nature, as in representing human characters or actions, conformity to nature affords a full and distinct criterion of what is truly beautiful. Reason hath in such cases full scope for exerting its authority; for approving or condemning; by comparing the copy with the original. But there are innumerable cases in which this rule cannot be at all applied; and conformity to nature is an expression frequently used, without any distinct or determinate meaning. We must therefore search for somewhat that can be rendered more clear and precise, to be the standard of taste.[26]

The clearer and more precise standard to which Blair appeals is the taste of men in general. That which men concur the most in admiring must be held to be the most beautiful. That person's taste must be esteemed just and true which coincides with the general sentiments of mankind. On this standard, then, Blair rests his theory. The ultimate criteria in all works of taste must be in the sense of mankind.

It is clear, however, that Blair does not intend that standards of taste should be determined by pure majority vote. To the contrary, he imposes rather severe restrictions on his concept of *men in general.* He does not believe that an individual must collect the voices of others before he forms any judgment for himself of what deserves to be praised. He states:

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 23.
[25] Hume, p. 269.
[26] Blair, p. 23.

By no means; there are principles of reason and sound judgment which can be applied to matters of taste, as well as to the subjects of science and philosophy. He who admires or censures any work of genius, is always ready, if his taste be in any degree improved, to assign some reasons for his decision. He appeals to principles and points out the ground on which he proceeds. Taste is a sort of compound power; in which the light of the understanding always mingles, more or less with the feelings of sentiment.[27]

Thus, in determining his standard of taste, Blair gives further consideration to the relative importance of nature and art. Both factors are included in the standard, but primary emphasis is given to nature, or sensibility, rather than to art, or reason. Although reason may be used to validate the criteria, the standards themselves are based on art. The ultimate conclusions to which reasoning leads are based, in the final analysis, on sense and perception. Reasoning may correct the caprice of unenlightened taste and establish principles for judging that which deserves praise; but, at the same time, these reasonings appeal ultimately to feeling. The foundation upon which they rest is what has been found from experience to please mankind universally.

Blair further limits his conception of the universal tastes of man by indicating that the doctrine of universal testimony is valid only if the men involved live in situations which are conducive to the proper exertions of taste. Any notions concerning taste which are entertained by rude and uncivilized people and during periods of ignorance and darkness carry no authority. The doctrine deals largely with "the sentiments of mankind in polished and flourishing nations; when arts are cultivated and manners refined; when works of genius are subject to free discussion, and taste is improved by science and philosophy."[28]

Even among such nations, at such a period of society, Blair admits that accidental causes may occasionally warp the proper operations of taste:

sometimes the form of government may for a while pervert; a licentious court may introduce a taste for false ornaments, and dissolute writings. The usage of one admired genius may procure approbation for his faults and even render them fashionable. Sometimes envy may have power to bear down, for a little, productions of great merit; while popular humour, or party spirit, may, at other times, exalt to a high, though shortlived reputation, what little deserves it. But though such casual circumstances give the appearances of caprice to the judgments of taste, that appearance is easily corrected. In the course of time, the genuine taste of human nature never fails to disclose itself and to gain the ascendant over any fantastic and corrupted modes of taste which may chance to have been introduced. These may have currency for a while, and mislead superficial judges; but being subject to examination, by degrees they pass away; while that alone remains which is founded on sound reason, and the native feelings of men.[29]

There is nothing particularly novel or startling in Blair's standard of taste. The ultimate appeal to the sentiment and feelings of *man in general* was an extremely pervasive part of eighteenth-century, neo-classical critical thought. McKillop points out that classicism based literature and criticism on the permanent and universal elements in human nature, that is, on man's long-run experiences of his own powers and limitations. In such experience, moderation, self-control, the need to come to terms with other men, clear communication, counted for most.[30] That position set up a central fixed standard, based at once on the uniformity of na-

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[30] Alan Dugald McKillop, *English Literature from Dryden to Burns* (New York, 1948), pp. 173-177.

ture, the workings of the rational mind, and the coherence of organized society. It did not exclude diversity or spontaneity from art or life, but it looked on them as secondary and limited. It preferred the stable, the normal, the continuous, and the predictable to the unstable, the abnormal, the discontinuous, and the unpredictable. It was thus with a firm foundation in eighteenth-century critical thought that Blair formulated his standard of taste. It was a point of view shared by many contemporary writers and was not, by any means, original with Blair.

Similar, though not identical, standards of taste had been posited by other writers of the period and it is quite possible that Blair's standards may have evolved from his contacts with Kames and Hume. Kames had found his standard of taste in the "common nature of man," a concept not far removed from the "nature of universal man":

> With respect to the common nature of man in particular, we have a conviction that is invariable not less than universal. Nor are we deceived: because giving allowance for the difference of culture and gradual refinement of manners, the fact corresponds to our conviction. We are so constituted as to conceive this common nature to be invariable, *perfect* or *right;* and that individuals *ought* to be made conformable to it. Every remarkable deviation from the standards makes an impression on us of imperfection, irregularity, or disorder. It is disagreeable and raises in us a painful emotion. . . . Thus upon a conviction common to the species is erected a standard of taste; which standard, ascertaining what actions are right or wrong, proper or improper has enabled moralists to establish rules for our conduct, from which no person is permitted to swerve. We have the same standard for ascertaining in all the fine arts, what is beautiful or ugly, high or low, proper or improper, proportioned or disproportioned.[31]

David Hume had also based his standard of taste on the universal and generally unvarying nature of man:

> The general principles of taste are uniform in human nature: where men vary in their judgments, some defect or perversion in the faculties may commonly be remarked; proceeding either from prejudice, from want of practice, or want of delicacy; and there is just reason for approving one taste and condemning another.[32]

Sir Joshua Reynolds had also chosen the universality of mankind as the basis for his standards of taste:

> I shall now say something on the part of *taste*, which as I have hinted to you before, does not belong so much to the external form of things, but is addressed to the mind and depends on its original frame, or to use the expression, the organisation of the soul; I mean the imagination and the passions. The principles of these are as invariable as the former, and are to be known and reasoned upon in the same manner, by an appeal to common sense depending upon the common feelings of mankind.[33]

Blair's theory of taste is reducible to several clearly defined propositions. Taste, in Blair's view, is far from being an arbitrary force which is subject to the fancy of every individual and which admits of no criteria for determining whether it is false or true. Its foundation is the same in all human minds. It is built upon sentiments and perceptions which belong to our nature; and which, in general, operate with the same uniformity as our other faculties. When those sentiments are perverted by ignorance and prejudice, they are capable of being rectified by reason. Their sound and natural state is ultimately determined by comparing them with the general taste of mankind. As Blair says, "In every composition, what interests the imagination and touches the heart pleases all ages and all nations. There is a certain string to which, when properly struck, the human heart is

[31] Kames, pp. 298-299.

[32] Hume, p. 280.

[33] Reynolds, pp. 200-201.

made to answer."[34] Blair himself epitomizes his theory of taste when he says, *"Opinium commenta delet dies; naturae judicia confirmat.* Time overflows the illusions of opinion but establishes the decisions of nature."

Blair does not directly apply his theory of taste to the judgment of specific speeches. The implication of his doctrine is quite clear, however. In order to criticize oratory effectively, the critic must have some criteria to which he can appeal. In this respect the evaluation of speeches does not differ from the criticisms of other works of art. Blair's advice to the critic is to base his standards of judgment partially on conformity to nature; partially on the rules of reason; and partially on the tastes of mankind in general. In addition it is clear that the rhetorical critic will apply the principles and instructions which are presented in the more strictly rhetorical sections of the *Lectures.*

[34] Blair, p. 26.

• • •

THE COMIC TENNESSEE WILLIAMS

Charles Brooks

ONCE again, in *Orpheus Descending*, Tennessee Williams has exhibited his chief weakness, an inability to bring his play to a satisfying denouement. His failure this time is different from his preceding one. *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* was a contrived triumph for the "cat" and her husband that was strikingly inadequate for the violence and bitterness of the struggle which preceded it, while *Orpheus Descending* contrives a waste of fruitful energy which is wanton, not tragic. But both failures are related to Williams' refusal (and the refusal of most of his critics and much of his audience) to recognize himself as an essentially comic playwright. He has been praised or blamed for his symbolism, his poetic language, his imaginative use of dramatic techniques, his study of neurotic women, his evocation of local mores. But his greatest power and appeal derive from a comic vision which he seems unwilling to trust fully.

The comic vision was first and most completely manifested in *The Rose Tattoo*. Before that it was blurred by the intrusion of murky symbolism and sentimental pathos, but when reviewed in relation to the technique of *The Rose Tattoo*, even *The Glass Menagerie* and *A Streetcar Named Desire* show this comic energy straining for release. In the most dramatically effective moments of all Williams' plays, striking contrasts reveal grotesque inadequacies of character and environment.

Mr. Brooks is a member of the Department of English at the Long Beach State College, California.

What is perhaps the most effective line in *The Rose Tattoo* shows how this comic contrast works. Standing before the idolized urn and seeking some assurance that the sailor's love for her daughter is sincere, Serafina asks him if he is Catholic. To his affirmative reply she then retorts suspiciously, "You don't look like a Catholic." It is a revelation of her own inadequacies—she worships sexuality but tries to repress her daughter's sexual drives; she professes faith but exercises bitter suspicion; she exalts religion but profanes it; she asserts her shrewdness, wisdom, and knowledge but remains ignorant of her own heart; she curses the prejudice of others but follows her own prejudices. But the revelation is not alone of the inconsistencies of character. It encompasses the attitudes of the world in which this character moves. Her religious adherence is to a church which prides itself on its catholicity, yet the inevitable racial and nationalistic prejudices of this church's members are exposed in Serafina's line—how can you be a Catholic if you are not Latin, if you do not share the non-religious as well as religious mores of a particular group? This is not, of course, an exposure of any shortcoming of the Catholic church, but of a gap which priests are well aware of between dogma and individual action. It is not Swiftian satire of hypocrisy, since the hypocrisy is rooted too deeply in character ever to be consciously practiced. Serafina's speech does point out how impossible or extremely difficult it is for a religious

or any other protestation to reflect adequately the total psyche and, consequently, the grotesqueness of our pose when we rationalize chaotic behavior with exalted pretense. Williams' great forte and most damning virtue is his knack for showing our most cherished protestations in this light; "most damning virtue," because his audiences will not always allow him to expose those protestations comically.

As Serafina says these words, she is planning to force the boy to vow before the icon the purity of his intentions. Outside, the daughter dashes about, trying frantically to interrupt this performance. Not only is Serafina profaning the ritual of the church to which she professes adherence, but she is also trying to deny her daughter the sexual pleasure which has been so important to herself, and she is trying to shut off the life force which religion celebrates; this she is doing, without the slightest awareness of the grotesque inconsistency of her action, by asking the boy to kneel before her husband's ashes (the urn stands in front of an image of the Virgin), by asking him to worship a phallic symbol while renouncing sexual pleasure. The scene is charged with comic irony, as is the whole play. Even in the rhythm of speech and action there is this irony—though ostensibly about a woman who isolates herself from the world, the play is noisy, violent, raucous, lively.

Williams catches precisely, as well as the vocal accents of his characters, the ruling attitudes of his locale—the intense Catholicism, the racial and family pride, the sexual emphasis, the love of food and drink, the strong sympathies and antipathies of the Sicilians of a Gulf-coast slum. But it is not this group alone whose attitudes are presented. In two brilliant scenes the smaller group is related to a larger environment. One of these scenes contrasts the insensitivity of a vulgar, garrulous American salesman to Serafina's depth of feeling at a moment when she is too emotionally exhausted to oppose him with her superior vigor. At the climax of the scene the salesman brutally maltreats a lusty truck driver, crushing the latter's self-respect. It is the ultimate manifestation of his vulgarity and cheapness, for he does it by a mean trick which works only because the truck driver is so devoted to fair play, so pure in heart himself, that he does not expect it. The fight has been precipitated by the salesman's racial insults, and in this result the means by which the majority tramples upon the minority is represented at the same time that it is evaluated. The blatant, brutal vulgarity of the class which the salesman represents is further emphasized by reference to one of the favorite entertainments of this class, reckless driving.

The automobile figures also in another key scene, when two blowzy representatives of the "respectable" citizenry welcome the raucous horn-tooting of some Legionnaires. These two women are profane, nasty, blackmailing, sordid, and salacious, yet they do not hesitate to hurl racial insults at Serafina. By contrast, in this scene, Serafina has unusual grace and dignity. No protestation of tolerance has to be uttered—racial prejudice is shown by effective comic action to be vulgar, stupid, and ugly. The scene again builds to a violent climax in which Serafina hales the offenders with a broom while from a distance can be heard the strains of a band performing in one of America's favorite rituals, the high-school graduation. The grotesque contrast of the

people and their customs places both in a comic light.

The one sharp weakness of *The Rose Tattoo* is the characterization of Serafina's daughter. In this characterization Williams presents with apparent approbation the very attitudes which he ridicules in the main action. Serafina's glorification of sexual desire is ridiculed; she insanely worships the ashes of her husband because he was so virile and so faithful, but gradually she sheds her illusions and discovers in love a simpler but more satisfying pleasure. Yet in Rosa and her boy friend the same overemphasis upon sex is presented as something wonderful. The consummation of Serafina's affair with the truck driver is a clownish failure, yet at the end Rosa and the sailor depart for their night in New Orleans as though to some magnificent triumph. The inadequacy of basing a marriage on sexual passion is made clear in Serafina's experience, yet the union of Rosa and Jack, after they have demonstrated no more than an inordinate sexual desire for each other, is launched with the sentimental cliche, "I want you to give me that little gold ring on your ear to put on my finger." The contrast between Rosa and her mother serves no comic purpose; it is a clash between a comic and a sentimental view of the same attitudes. Serafina, in spite of her grotesque illusions, is the healthy one in the play, by her emotional sincerity and her carelessness about dress, ritual, graduation ceremonies, work, and politeness exposing the pretenses of others. The attempt to praise these very pretenses in the sentimental presentation of Rosa weakens an otherwise fine comedy.

The same comic attack upon unhealthy attitudes is made in *Baby Doll*. One scene beautifully demonstrates the mastery which the Southern Negro has over the whites—the husband, laughing proudly at the wisecracks which he has hurled at his wife, looks to a group of Negroes for approbation only to get a stony response, while when the wife hurls wisecracks in rebuttal the Negroes roll on the ground with merriment. Another scene presents the finest image of racial intolerance which has perhaps been achieved by our artists when the drunken "white" husband wallows on the ground blubbering insults at the Sicilian, who calmly and triumphantly watches him from above. The American male's overemphasis upon virility is made ugly in this same characterization of the husband, while the sloppy, mindless, juvenile heroine is a delightful parody of the sexy woman exalted by the Hollywood myth. The inadequacies of the ordinary sex attitudes of our culture are made especially grotesque by contrast with the realistic presentation of sexual adventure when the Sicilian chases the heroine about the house and the two work up a frenzy of desire and restraint. The visual representation of this emotional experience is so successful as to make many intelligent spectators uncomfortable in its presence—the usual moxie treatment of the theme of spying is too removed from reality to be taken seriously, but here a spectator has a genuine feeling of eavesdropping upon emotions too private to be watched. Yet there is justification in the comic light thereby thrown upon cherished illusions.

This comic evaluation of cultural illusions is obscured, however, by the symbolic nonsense about baby cribs. Erotic attitudes, ridiculed in the presentation of the vulgar, salacious husband and in the realistic portrayal of the seduction, are exploited in certain scenes and satisfied in the final cradle scene as though they were worthy to be

satisfied. Here they are not comically evaluated, but presented as somehow noble, negating the comic statement. Shakespeare's romantic lovers never lose their perspective; Williams himself loses his.

The failure in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* is more fatal. Here Williams' comic vision pierces certain obsessions America has about marriage. A family feud over an inheritance is nothing new, but Williams' treatment of child-worship is fresh and vigorous. Throughout the play "five screamin' monkeys like parrots in a jungle" tear wildly about while their mother, basically greedy, selfish, and spiteful, coos sickening nonsense to them. Everyone is supposed to adjust his life to these monstrous children: no matter how they slobber and drool over the tablecloth and the guests' clothing, the children must eat at the family table; everyone must applaud their gawkish, unwanted, and extended singing performance; the sister-in-law must calmly accept their precocious and vulgar insults; all belongings must be toys for the children, and no one should have possessions which might be dangerous for these grasping young ones. The attitude of child-worship is made ridiculous by the grotesque presentation of the object worshiped, and the falsity of the attitude is exposed by the presentation of the mother's true motive, not love but greed. It is still more strikingly attacked in the presentation of the old man, who dislikes his son and hates his grandchildren, yet demands assurance of offspring before he will assign his property. Also, momism is ridiculed through the contempt hidden under sentimentality which the sons and daughters-in-law have for "Big Mama." Social climbing, relentless cattiness, jealousy, false worship of virility, hollow marital relationships based only on lust or mutual greed are all exposed as part of the American complex. But the comic vision is hopelessly obscured. At one moment the heroine's cat-qualities are set against her sister-in-law's child-worship to expose the folly of both women—"Why did you give dawgs' names to all your kiddies? . . . Sound t'me like an animal act in a circus, four dogs and a parrot!" "Maggie, honey, why are you so catty?" But finally Maggie's ability to scratch her way to success is presented as an admirably strong trait. Gooper and Mae are ridiculed for glossing their greed with a sentimental child-worship, yet Maggie and Brick triumph with the same device. The hollowness of a marriage in which lust is the only tie is exposed through the relationship of Big Daddy and Big Mama, yet the climax to which it all builds is the lustful embrace of a couple who have discovered nothing admirable in each other but sexuality. Lusting for one another, having children in order to be socially acceptable, using any deceits to succeed, out-catting and out-climbing others—these qualities, objects of a vigorous comic attack at various points in the play, are finally presented as the sources of a supposedly healthy comic triumph.

Williams' failure in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* is more evident by comparison with O'Neill's success in *Desire Under the Elms*. Big Daddy has some of the powerful hardness and truth-to-self of O'Neill's old man as well as the same virility, selfishness, and love of property. Both plays present relentless familial competition; both plays present greed, lust, self-seeking; both plays are about a struggle for land. In both plays the central characters have their strengths and weaknesses, and in *Desire Under the Elms* there are two weak brothers to contrast with the strong central charac-

ters just as Gooper and Mae contrast with Brick and Maggie. But O'Neill's characters triumph through their strengths and fail through their weaknesses. They are too strong ever to be ridiculous, too doomed by their own personalities ever to be comic. Williams' characters are supposed to arouse sympathy by the very lusts which have a moment before made them grotesque, and the traits which are weaknesses in some characters are supposed to be strengths in others.

Williams' most successful plays are those with a character forceful enough to command admiration in spite of folly—*The Rose Tattoo* and *The Glass Menagerie*. The heroines of these plays control their lives in spite of the follies they absorb from their environments. Their vigor helps them to expose the follies of others while they themselves skirt the edge of ridicule enough to arouse laughter without becoming so small that they are merely ridiculous. In *The Rose Tattoo* the flossies, the mocking neighbors, the waitress and in *The Glass Menagerie* the Gentleman Caller and Tom are the comic victims in the clash of temperament and attitudes with these vigorous heroines. And the sentimentalities of the plays—Rosa's elopement, Tom's attempt to encompass the action of *The Glass Menagerie* as though his own genius transcended that of his mother and sister—can be ignored in a genuine comic triumph of these vigorous personalities over their own frailties and over the idiocies of their environments.

Tennessee Williams' most regrettable failure is *A Streetcar Named Desire*, where the comic contrast produces his most effective scenes and yet the obscurity of vision is too marked to be ignored.

Blanche and Stanley are perfect foils for one another. *Summer and Smoke*, where the contrast is too simplified to be as effective, is the only other Williams play where two characters are so well opposed. From the moment when Blanche first appears and reacts unfavorably to Stanley's home, the clash builds. Stanley's manliness, frankness, and simplicity constantly expose Blanche's pretentiousness. She shudders at the smallness of his home, she who is homeless, who has lost a plantation and fallen back on his charity; what she sees as emptiness because it lacks frills and decorations yet houses a vigor and love of which her own life is void. When she attempts to flirt with him, Stanley crushes her design with a deflating "I don't go in for that stuff." All her lies about her beauty, her past, her age he exposes with relentless reference to facts. But the exposure is not one-sided. Blanche's presence just as relentlessly exposes Stanley's brutishness. When he presses for records about the loss of the plantation, she snows them upon him, an appropriate climax to his ridiculous insistence upon the "Napoleonic code." His conduct at the supper table illustrates her characterization of him as "something not quite to the stage of humanity yet." And his "birthday present" of the bus ticket, thrown at her without warning, shows him devoid of normal feeling. By contrast with the other, each character is shown to be inadequate for healthy civilized life. Joseph Wood Krutch (*"Modernism" in Modern Drama*), indicating the possibility of siding with either Blanche or Stanley, interprets the play as ambiguously containing two possible meanings. Rather it is a comic battle with neither character demanding sympathy—until in the denouement Williams forces the spectator to take sides.

In general Stanley gets the best of his

verbal exchanges with Blanche. His direct remarks constantly undermine her inflated pretenses. But the action favors Blanche. In the scene where he demands records of the loss of the plantation, he constantly gets the last word, as in the following:

STANLEY: I never met a woman that didn't know if she was good-looking or not without being told, and some of them give themselves credit for more than they've got. I once went out with a doll who said to me, "I am the glamorous type!" I said, "So what?"

BLANCHE: And what did she say then?

STANLEY: She didn't say nothing. That shut her up like a clam.

BLANCHE: Did it end the romance?

STANLEY: It ended the conversation.

But his bull-headed insistence on the "Napoleonic code," his inability to recognize the value of her imitation furs and jewelry, and his rifling of her trunk more and more display his stupidity until the climactic moment when he sits at the table and she floods him with documents. She is constantly left speechless by his exposures of her lies, but his acts become more and more brutish.

The great scenes build to unexpected actions that are highly satisfying in their ego-deflations—Blanche snowing Stanley with papers; Stanley ending a dispute over playing the radio by throwing the radio out the window; Stanley clearing the table by sweeping the dishes to the floor. But neither character can afford to win or lose. The triumph of brute force after it has been successfully ridiculed is not comic, and Blanche's defeat can be tragic only if the artificialities she has clung to can be taken as strengths that have been torn from her instead of pretenses stripped away. We are asked at the end to admire what we have laughed at, Stanley's animality or Blanche's pretense of culture.

We are shown two aspects of modern American life. One is the nursing of illusion and pretense—the girl trying to romanticize herself by externals, the girl trying to nab a man, any man, and calling it "love," the falsifying of true relationships by exaggerating the money, position, or "culture" involved. "Such things as art—as poetry and music—such kinds of new light have come into the world since then! In some kinds of people some tenderer feelings have had some little beginning!" says Blanche; but art, poetry, and music are to her just things to talk about to impress people, just more airs to put on, and her feelings are tender only about herself. The other aspect is the down-to-earth one—poker playing, drinking, bowling, and lusting; life without any foolishness. The folly of both aspects is amply exposed, yet finally Blanche is made pathetic on the ground that her illusions were worth holding and Stanley is made triumphantly realistic as he kneels beside his pregnant wife and "his fingers find the opening of her blouse."

Williams' mixture of comedy and tragedy is not the same as O'Casey's. O'Casey is successfully ambivalent, at every moment seeing both the comic and serious aspects of characters and action. Williams shifts from comic exposure to sympathy, with the result that his plays tend to fall apart. When he is clearly comic, he is fresh and vigorous, attacking as he does follies which are rooted in our culture, not, as most so-called comic authors do, those from which we can easily divorce ourselves. But a sustained dramatic triumph with such an attack can be maintained only by a playwright detached enough to distinguish between the strength and weakness of his culture, writing for an audience which feels secure enough of

the basic health of its culture to be able to laugh at its own follies. Either Williams cannot maintain his detachment, or his audience will not permit him. John Rosenfield (*Southwest Review,* Autumn 1953) blames the general weakness of our drama on an audience which does not permit playwrights to attack the environment. Perhaps this is the reason for Williams' weakness. There have been many recent indications that Americans are unsure of their cultural aspirations—many frantic attempts to protect by force drives which would need no protection were we sure of them. Perhaps our unfriendly reception of unwavering comic visions is another manifestation of insecurity. Self-ridicule requires a sure, strong person and an optimistic society.

* * *

JOHN UDALL AND THE PURITAN SERMON

Everett H. Emerson

ONE of the most striking characteristics of the seventeenth-century Puritan sermon is its precise and almost stereotyped organization. Puritan preachers methodically divided and subdivided their sermons, the main parts being a brief exegesis of the text, the setting forth of a doctrine drawn from the text, explanations of the reasons for the doctrine, and applications or uses of the doctrine in the business of living. The subdivisions are labelled plainly "secondly," "thirdly," et cetera. Yet if one goes to the predecessors of these preachers, to Edward Dering (a preacher of the 1560's and '70's) or George Gifford (whose sermons were published in the 1580's and '90's), for instance, one finds little of this systematization. Indeed, it has been wisely said that in Elizabethan sermons, Puritan and non-Puritan, "the art of composition, the art of arranging ideas in a structure of ordered beauty, was practiced only in the most elementary way."[1]

John Udall, a vigorous Puritan clergyman who died in prison in 1592 and is best known for his connection with the Marprelate controversy,[2] was aware of the lack of plan in most sermons of his day, though, like most Puritans, little concerned with the lack of beauty. In the preface to *A Commentarie Vpon the Lamentations of Jeremy* (London, 1593), he observes that the proper method of handling Scripture in a sermon has been much disputed, with the result that there is among Englishmen an "infinite varietie of preaching." But there should be, he asserts, a single best method. At present, Udall reports, people are

> brought either into such amazednesse, as they thinke that any thing may be made of Scriptures, or to such an unsettlednesse in iudgement, as they rather hunt after varietie of teachers for their straunge manner of preaching, then for sound instruction for their own edification.

To remedy this situation, Udall made a proposal which was an important contribution to the development of sermon form. He proposed that the preacher first provide "the cleere and evident deliverance of the sense of the text in hand." Secondly, since

> euery sentence of the holy Scripture containeth in it (at least) one generall doctrine . . . the next thing that is to be understood, is, the collecting of the same out of the text, in such plain and manifest manner, as must needes be acknowledged in the conscience of the hearers to be so; which being enlarged by the examples and testimonies of the Scripture, and manifested by the force of reason grounded upon the same, must needes take such roote in the conscience of the hearers, as they shall either bee thoroughly perswaded of the trueth of it (if it be rightly and effectively handled) or leave such a print therein as shall convince the same.

This plea for the inclusion of reasons or proofs for the doctrines drawn out

Mr. Emerson (Ph.D., Louisiana, 1955) is a member of the Department of English at Lehigh University.

[1] Alan F. Herr, *The Elizabethan Sermon* (Philadelphia, 1940), p. 87. Both the preachers named, Dering and Gifford, were outspoken Puritans whose nonconformity caused them to be silenced; they are typical of the main Puritan movement in Elizabeth's reign. For a discussion of the continuity of the Puritan tradition implied in this paper, see William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1938).

[2] King James is said to have called him "the greatest scholar in Europe." C. H. and T. Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses* (London, 1858-61), II, 149.

of the sermon text appears to be John Udall's contribution. The title page of the commentary also notes Udall's suggestion. The commentary, it reports, demonstrates the citation of "examples . . . shewing how the . . . doctrines have been verified in experience" and "the reason or proofe of every doctrine."

The book in which Udall describes his plan consists of a series of sermon notes abridged in order to demonstrate clearly the idea. Each doctrine drawn out of the text is supplied with from one to four reasons and a number of uses. For instance, here is a sample, the commentary on Lamentations i:21 ("They have heard that I do mourn and there is none to comfort me; all mine enemies have heard of my trouble and are glad that thou hast done it; thou hast brought the day that thou hast pronounced and they shall be like unto me"):

> Doctrine: It is the dutie of all men to comfort the afflicted, & not to add to their miseries, Math. 25.40. Iames 1.27. 1 Cor. 12.46. Heb. 13.3. The reason is, because, first, we owe this dutie (among others) one to another. Secondly, no miserie can befall another, but when God will, it may light vpon our selues, seeing we daily deserue the same. The use is, first, to reproue them that doe not take any mans miserie to heart but their owne. Secondly, to teach vs, to labour our harts to be like afflected with others; even to mourne with them that weepe &c. seeing it is a signe of a liuely member: as the want therof argueth, either that we are cut off, or were never ingraffed into that bodie whereof Christ Iesus is the head. (p. 53)

Udall's commentary was very popular, as is evinced by its going through at least six editions or issues through 1637. The originality of the proposal concerning the use of "proofs" may be suggested by the fact that William Perkins, perhaps the most influential Elizabethan Puritan, proceeds directly from doctrine to application in his widely read "The Art of Prophecying" (first published in 1592). Perkins comments in passing, "Any point of doctrine collected by iust consequence is simply of it selfe to be beleeued and doth demonstrate."[3] But it was the structure proposed by Udall which became something like the standard form for many seventeenth-century Puritan preachers.

The difference between the earlier Puritan sermon and the fully developed, almost stereotyped sermon of the 1620's and later may be suggested by a comparison of a typical sermon of Richard Greenham, who died at about the age of sixty in 1594, and one by John Cotton, delivered not long before 1633. Both Greenham and Cotton were prominent Puritans. Greenham's rather informal sermon entitled "Of the Good Education of Children"[4] is on Proverbs xvii:21: "He that begetteth a foole, getteth himself sorrowe." Greenham first explains that by "fool" is meant one who is ignorant in religious matters, or who knowingly is wicked. Such a one, Greenham notes, parents seldom grieve for, though they are saddened should their child lack other gifts. Next the preacher points out the duty of parents to increase the number of God's elect. He urges parents to realize that the cause of their children's sinfulness may be in the parents themselves and in the example they set. Finally he warns parents to discipline their children properly, though he adds that the young men who hear him should not blame their parents for their own sins, but should assume responsibility for their own moral behavior. In contrast to this loosely organized sermon, Cotton's sermon "Gods Mercy in His Peoples De-

[3] Perkins' *Workes* (London, 1608), II, 751. "The Art of Prophecying" was originally published in Latin as *Prophetica, sive de sacra et unica ratione concionandi* (Cambridge, 1592).

[4] *Workes* (5th ed., London, 1612).

liverance"[5] explains the significance of the key words in the text, draws from the text a doctrine, supports it with a "reason" (introduced by the formula-like phrase "Now for the Reason"), applies the doctrine with a use, cites two more doctrines, defends one with one reason and the other with four, and provides several uses for each doctrine.

Of course Udall alone was not responsible for these striking differences. But though some study of the structure of the Puritan sermon has been made,[6] no one has explained the process by which the seventeenth-century Puritan sermon took form. When such a study is made, the contribution of John Udall must be taken into account. As Thomas Fuller said of him, he was "no less profitable, than painfull, in his preaching. For, as *Musculus* in *Germany* (if I mistake not) first brought in the plain, (but effectual) manner of preaching by *Use* and *Doctrine:* So *Udal* was the first who added *reasons* thereunto, the strength and sinews of a Sermon."[7]

[5] *Gods Mercie Mixed With His Iustice* (London, 1641; facsimile reprint, Gainesville, Fla., 1958).

[6] See W. Fraser Mitchell, *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson* (London, 1932) and the materials for the study of English pulpit oratory listed exhaustively by Harry Kaplan and H. H. King, "Pulpit Oratory; A List of Doctrinal and Historical Studies in English," *SM*, XXII (1955), No. 4. Neither of these works recognizes the part played by Udall in the development of sermon form.

[7] *Church History of Britain* (London, 1655), Book IX, Section VIII, paragraph 3 (Part II, p. 222). Fuller was a low-churchman, not unsympathetic to Puritanism.

* * *

NOTES ON DEBATING IN THE BRITISH ISLES

Waldo W. Braden

DURING a recent trip abroad I had the opportunity to visit several British and Irish debating societies while they were carrying on their normal activities. My itinerary included university colleges as well as universities and provincial institutions as well as the more famous ones.[1] In the present paper I propose to report on my observations.

Debating societies are found in almost every university college and university and in many training and technical colleges in the British Isles. Many operate as one of the activities of the student unions, which conduct the extra-curricular athletic, cultural, and social activities on the campuses. In universities like those of London, Durham, and Manchester, there are debating groups within the colleges as well as one for the university as a whole. For example, Manchester University has three societies: one for men, one for women, and a third in the College of Technology. At the University of London, in addition to the Union Debating Society, debating is carried on at Bedford College, Birkbeck College, the London School of Economics, Queen Mary College, and University College. The Philosophical Society and the Historical Society compete at famous Trinity College, Dublin.

In many respects the English and Irish debating groups which I observed were much like the literary societies which were popular in American colleges last century and still persist in a few eastern and southern institutions. They were completely extra curricular and student directed, receiving little guidance or support from the faculty. British students and faculty members with whom I talked were indeed curious about the responsibilities of an American director of debate. In discussing the matter one student asked me, "Is it true that you have debate coaches just like football coaches?" Often I also encountered difficulty in explaining the title professor of speech, which seemed to suggest to my acquaintances a concentration upon teaching pronunciation and voice control. I succeeded in getting through to a headmaster of a county grammar school by mentioning that I taught what Richard Whately called rhetoric.

Several of the societies, including those at Glasgow, Edinburgh, Cambridge, Oxford, London, and Trinity, have their own debating halls. The one at Cambridge is located in the Union Building, first opened October 30, 1866.[2] The room is a square one. The

Mr. Braden (Ph.D., Iowa, 1942) is Chairman of the Department of Speech at Louisiana State University and a former Executive Secretary of the SAA. He has recently spent several months on leave in England.

[1] I visited and heard debates at the following schools: Cambridge University, University of London, Trinity College of Dublin, University College of Dublin, University College of North Wales, Manchester University, and University College of the University of London.

[2] The Union has also a library of 45,000 volumes, a dining room, a bar lounge, reading and writing rooms, a music room equipped with gramophone, radio, television, and piano, a billiard room, and squash courts. From a booklet entitled "Cambridge Union Society, Michaelmas Term, 1957."

main floor, which seats about two hundred fifty to three hundred, is reserved entirely for the membership, restricted to men. The president presides from a high-backed chair on a dais located in the center front of the main floor. Directly below him, on the floor level, the secretary sits at a small table. On each side are approximately eight rows of benches facing toward the center. A narrow balcony wide enough for one row of chairs and extending around the room is reserved for visitors, including women and reporters.

The arrangement and furnishings of this room, like some other meeting halls I visited, have many characteristics of the House of Commons. In some instances a long rectangular table like the great oaken table in Commons was placed between the facing benches or chairs. Similar to members of the Cabinet and shadow Cabinet, the officers and debaters sat on the front benches, but unlike their illustrious models the students ordinarily did not put their feet on the table, an occurrence which I witnessed in both houses of Parliament. In some cases they even duplicated on the end of the table the "despatch boxes," which serve as improvised lecterns. To speak, the debater stood at his place or moved to the despatch box and talked to his opponents and those sitting opposite him without any attempt to encompass the listeners as a whole or to establish with them what public speaking textbooks call "direct eye contact."

The attendance at the debates which I heard was excellent. A debate at Cambridge drew a full house of about five hundred. In addition to filling the benches on the main floor, members sat in the aisles, on the arms of the benches, and even on the floor. In the balcony, visitors occupied every seat and were happy to stand through the evening around the entire room.

Over three hundred students turned out on a Saturday night for an "impromptu"[3] at the Literary and Historical Society of University College, Dublin. At Manchester University a debate scheduled between 12:45 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. filled a large auditorium. A most amazing debate audience was one at the University College of North Wales, Bangor. While waiting for speakers to arrive, the students gave college yells and sang campus songs. After the division of the house, they gave the winning team a hearty cheer which would have rivaled those heard at American football games.

In their procedures these societies also showed many traces of the parliamentary influence. At the opening of the meeting the sergeant-at-arms intoned to the assembled members, "Please rise for Mr. Speaker." The officers and debaters marched in a formal procession down the center aisle to their places.[4] The president was usually dressed in formal clothes including a swallow-tail coat; the others were in tuxedoes. In addition, in some groups like the one at Cambridge they also wore their traditional academic robes. The presiding officer of the debating society of the University College of North Wales donned a bright red academic robe to give dignity to the meeting. At University College, London, the opening mom-

[3] An "impromptu" or "impromptu debate" is not a debate in the usual sense. The evening consists of impromptu speeches on topics like the following: "That the western delegates to the United Nations are the playboys of the western world," "That to be a gentleman, one must have a private income," "That the heart is a wonder," and "That civilization is peculiar to townspeople."

[4] Each day the House of Commons is opened by the Speaker and his assistants marching to their places in stately procession. The meeting is opened when the sergeant-at-arms places the mace on two rests on the Table of the House.

ents were made more impressive by having a uniformed porter place on two rests on the table a mace, a miniature of the silver-gilt ornamented club used in the House of Commons. The members sat when the president declared the meeting open.

The debater opened by addressing his remarks to the presiding officer, "Mr. Speaker, Sir." At climactic moments when an American debater is wont to say, "Ladies and Gentlemen," the British student punctuated his sentences with, "Mr Speaker, Sir." Seldom did he refer to an opponent by name. In fact, one presiding officer interrupted a visitor to remind him that he had violated a rule of the society by using his opponent's name.[5] At Cambridge, debaters spoke of Oxford as "that other University" as members in the Commons refer to the House of Lords as "another place." Likewise at Trinity College, the members of the Philosophical Society called the Historical Society "that other society."

The presidency of a debating society was recognized as one of the outstanding campus honors. I was told that elections were keenly contested, and many times the campaigning was bitter and hard-fought. Once elected, the president or speaker assumed serious and time-consuming responsibilities which included selecting motions, inviting outside speakers, arranging debates, entertaining guests, and coordinating the activities of the society. My observation was that he was generally a fluent and effective speaker who presided with dignity and firmness. When he was under fire, he often exercised adroitness and finesse, countering interruptions, parliamentary maneuvers, and humorous motions with sharp and forceful replies. When the members became boisterous and unruly, he reestablished order by persuasion or by the force of his personality.

The English and Irish debating societies report that they consider a different proposition at each weekly or bimonthly meeting. They have nothing comparable to the national intercollegiate questions used in the United States. They argued humorous as well as serious, and cultural and philosophical as well as political and economic topics, which are generally worded as propositions of fact or value. They delighted in putting the motions in figurative language like the following: "That this house regrets the passing of Queen Victoria" or "That this house has no time for space." Below are several other popular topics:

That the increase in educational facilities has improved neither morals nor manners.
That any form of literary censorship is to be condemned.
That politics is no career for a true product of a liberal education.
That the Arts have contributed more to human happiness than the Sciences.
That the Scientist should be completely free from the moral responsibility of his discoveries.
That it is better to leave the past to history.
That professionalism in sport is a bad influence.
That the influence of the Trade Unions has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.
That the seat of learning needs patching.
That this house feels too secure.
That woman is more ornamental than useful.
That the Old School Tie should be worn on all occasions.
That it is better to split hairs over the conference table than heads on the battlefield.
That Keat's dictum "Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty" is false.
That oratory is the harlot of the arts.

The societies I visited conducted their meetings much like any other organization following parliamentary procedure.

[5] In the House of Commons a member is never mentioned by name. He may be referred to as the "Right Honorable Gentleman" or "The member from Woodford" [Churchill].

The agenda included the reading of the minutes, private business, and public business. The secretary was likely to write into the minutes an extensive summary of what had been said in the debate. He attempted to make his report interesting and amusing by a flourish of style, by quoting witty remarks, or by emphasizing what was clever in the speeches. The reading of the minutes often invited humorous questions, irrelevant motions, and good-natured interchanges between the members and the presiding officer.

Private business concerned the internal problems of the society and announcements about future activities and decisions reached by the officers and executive committee. Generally the members again responded with humorous motions and parliamentary byplay. For example, at University College, Dublin, a member facetiously stirred up considerable feminine opposition by moving that women should be excluded from the society. This motion and similar ones consumed over an hour and one-half in contrast to five minutes devoted to a vital matter.

The debate was of course the main item of public business. Teams were usually composed of two or three speakers, each of whom spoke for fifteen to twenty minutes. Often the roster included two to four distinguished guests, selected for their expertness on the subject under discussion.[6] For example, in arguing the proposition: "That Fleet Street [newspapers] is of more value to the community than Portland Place [British Broadcasting Company]," the Cambridge Union had enlisted two journalists and two radio personalities to join the student speakers on the three-men teams.[7] The students served as the mover and opposer, then the guests were "seconders." Varying this pattern, the Literary and Historical Society of University College of Dublin follows the custom of calling upon distinguished outsiders to preside at its debates.

The second phase consisted of short rejoinders by the members from the floor, usually limited in length to three to five minutes. Although they seldom called time on the principal debaters, the presiding officer or the secretary kept a tight rein on these later efforts. In contrast to the American custom of limiting the argument to one hour, some British groups continued two to four hours, in fact as long as interest or speakers persisted. To close the debate, the mover and the opposer summarized the arguments on each side; then there followed a division of the house. But often by this time, because of the lateness of the hour, many members had disappeared from loss of interest or sheer exhaustion.

Many groups reported that they attempt to provide favorable speaking opportunities for the "maiden" or beginning speakers. They forbid heckling during a first appearance. At Cambridge, for example, the members became quiet and attentive when the president said, "The house will now hear a maiden

[6] Well known speakers who have appeared recently before the Cambridge Union include the following: the Rev. Dr. Donald Soper; Sir Oswald Mosley; John Betjeman; Sir Richard Acland; Kingsley Martin; the Marquess of Reading; Hugh Gaitskell, M.P.; Clement Davies, M.P.; Miss C. A. Lejeune; Sir Compton Mackenzie; Hugh Dalton, M.P.; Sir Norman Birkett; James Laver; Lady Astor; Stephen Potter; Gilbert Harding; Godfrey Winn; Sir Harold Nicolson; Jimmy Edwards; Bernard Braden; Richard Crossman, M.P.; Sir Robert Boothby, M.P.; J. Strachey, M.P.; Herbert Morrison, M.P.; Malcolm Muggeridge; Gerard Hoffnung; Lord Beveridge; Earl Attlee; Nancy Spain; and Johnny Dankworth. From booklet entitled "Cambridge Union Society, Michaelmas Term, 1957."

[7] The journalists were Henry Fairlie and George Schwartz. The radio representatives were Lionel Gamlin and Paul Jennings.

speech by Mr. Smith." At the conclusion of the beginner's speech, the presiding officer took a moment to congratulate the novice. Some societies gave over one or two entire meetings each year to "freshers' debate." The meeting of the Philosophical Society of Trinity College, which I visited, consisted of such a program. Two older members served as mover and opposer; then, in the role of seconders, seven freshman speakers spoke on each side. At the end the president summarized what had been said in order to give time for the "adjudication committee," composed of three former officers, to discuss and evaluate the performers. Thereupon the chairman of that committee took the floor, complimented the various participants, and in the end announced the person whom the committee adjudged the best.

I observed that the listeners, like members of the House of Commons, looked upon themselves as active participants in the debates. They sat crowded around the speakers, providing what Winston Churchill once referred to as "a sense of crowd and urgency." When compared with their American counterparts, they were much more vocal. They interrupted, asked questions, and offered cutting asides. They applauded or cheered good points, clever turns of language, and apt retorts. They sometimes expressed approval with cries of "Hear, hear," and, in at least one society, with foot stamping. Likewise they were quick to pick up an unpopular remark or a slip of the tongue, which was likely to bring forth groans, cries of "shame, shame," or off-the-cuff comments. Opponents or members of the audience frequently rose to "a point of information" or "a point of order." The presiding officer might or might not recognize these interruptions. In turn the speaker sometimes attempted to ignore a heckler. At exciting climaxes, members baited a speaker to see how he would respond. If he silenced his tormenter, he was cheered; but if he failed, he received little sympathy. One listener whom I heard at Manchester blew a little horn for remarks which he approved or disapproved. Probably much to his disappointment, no one paid any attention to his blasts. But when the debate was thrown open to the floor, he presented a little speech about his horn, irrelevant and not very witty.

What about debating techniques? I was surprised that many speakers whom I heard made little attempt at formal analysis, case-planning, or teamwork. They did not define terms or attempt to explain what the proposition implied. Each one went his own merry way, taking little notice of what had come before. On a given side, persons sometimes disagreed as much with colleagues as with opponents. Many used copious notes or even manuscripts which they read. They altered little their remarks in light of the previous flow of argument; consequently they were sometimes guilty of unnecessary repetition, inclusion of irrelevant material, and a lack of direct clash.[8] Sometimes when

[8] A comment which I read in *The Observer* for February 13, 1955, leads me to believe that these tendencies may be general ones. The reporter, probably Kenneth Harris, in commenting on contests which he had judged in the National Debating Tournament, said:

"There was still a large proportion of entrants who read or recited carefully prepared speeches and made no attempt to refute points made by earlier speakers.

"Many teams suffered because the two members had not shared out the ground to be covered and consequently made speeches which overlapped—the brightest and liveliest team in the Southern semi-finals failed to reach finals solely on this account. If there were a general weakness evident throughout most of the 200 or so individual competitions it was their tendency to make speeches rather than to advance arguments."

challenged, a speaker returned a humorous or even a stinging retort, but not a well developed answer. I heard sweeping assertions and broad generalizations, unsupported by evidence or authority. In many cases, I thought too much emphasis was placed upon clever language and humor instead of thorough analysis and sound argument. Contrary to what others have observed, I did not find the level of speaking superior to that of good American student speakers. Unfortunately I did not have the opportunity to visit the Oxford Union, which is reported to maintain excellent standards of presentation.

Many of the debates seemed to have entertainment as their primary goal. But, when I talked to the officers about their programs, they always insisted that their primary purpose was to train students to speak more effectively. They defended the frivolity, the horseplay, and disorder as a part of challenging the speakers. They emphasized their eagerness to provide realistic speaking situations.

In reporting on British collegiate debating in 1946, Temple and Dunn, members of the Bates College team who toured England immediately after World War II, concluded that "the British do not sanction tournaments or even inter-university debates, but engage in . . . verbal conflict between members of their own Union."[9] This observation, I discovered, is no longer true. I was surprised to learn that, although the competition is decidedly different from the forensic contests on this side of the Atlantic, the students in British, Scottish, and Irish universities and colleges are participating more and more in what they call "inter-varsity debating."

[9] Norman J. Temple and Edward P. Dunn, "British Debating Is Parliamentary," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXIV (1948), pp. 50-53.

The societies with which I am familiar report that during a given year they entertain students from several nearby universities.[10] The Chairman of Debates of the University of Leicester writes, "We send delegations to take part in debates at surrounding midland universities—Sheffield and Hull, for example, and in turn act as host to them at our own debates. This session, we have entertained people from as far afield as Swansea [University College], and as close as Loughborough [Loughborough College]."[11]

The Debate Union of Hull University and the Nottingham University Debating Society report holding eight or nine "inter-varsity debates" during a session. The visitors probably do not form a team which opposes a team of the host group. More likely, they join members of the host society as well as distinguished guests on the side of their preference in upholding their convictions (similar to what Americans refer to as split teams). I heard a debate at the Union Society of the University of London between two three-man teams discussing the proposition, "It is better to leave the past to history." The mover and opposer were local speakers; the seconders were two distinguished guests and representatives from the University College of North Wales and Glasgow University.

The most extensive inter-varsity competition, however, is provided in the National Student Debating Tournament, conducted under the leadership of the National Union of Students, an organ-

[10] The conclusion is based upon correspondence from society officials at Chelsea College; University College, Dublin; Southampton University; Nottingham University; The University, Hull; University of Leicester; Liverpool University; and Leeds University, as well as personal observation made while the author was abroad during the fall of 1957.

[11] Letter to author.

ization which coordinates student activities of all types of collegiate institutions in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland.[12] The tournament, first conducted during 1953-54, completed its fifth competition during the past year.

Fred Jarvis, who was president of the National Union of Students in 1953, explains the origin of the tournament as follows:

> One of the factors which had set me thinking about the need for such a tournament was the problem we had had in the National Union of Students in trying to select student debating teams to travel abroad under the auspices of the British Council. I was confronted with this problem in 1952, and it was something of a drawback that we had no information available at national level as to which universities and colleges had the best debators. Something like a national tournament would, I felt, help us to form a much better picture, and this would enable us to send truly representative debating teams abroad.
>
> There was, however, another and more important reason which led to the introduction of the tournament. I felt that the general standard of debating in university circles was declining, and that we ought to find some way of trying to promote (a) greater interest in debating and (b), to raise the standard of debating. My feeling about the general standard of debating was, it appeared, shared by many other people, and the idea of a tournament was quite widely supported when it was put forward.[13]

As now organized, the competition progresses through five phases: local contests, preliminaries, regionals, semi-finals, and finals. Each society decides on its own method for selecting its representatives. Several report using committees of students to select speakers from those "who have spoken outstandingly well from the table and who speak repeatedly from the floor of the house."[14] The society at Chelsea Polytechnic in London, however, convenes "a special debate" for this purpose. The Chairman of Debates explains:

> The Convenor of Debates prepares a set of motions, known only to him or her, and each speaker picks the unseen motion, and after five to ten minutes of thought on the motion speaks on it. The speaker can either speak for or against the motion. The audience then choose the best speakers by voting, and the team is then made up for the competition.[15]

The national office of the National Student Union designates the host schools, the pairings, and the propositions to be used. Last year, six different topics were framed for the preliminaries, and different sets were used for each of the later rounds. The officers of the host school arrange the exact date, notify the participating societies, select the judges (with the consent of other groups), and stage the contest.

The preliminary round, scheduled before Christmas, encompasses fifteen or sixteen meets, each of which brings together two or three societies from schools in a given area. In England alone in 1957-1958, there were fifteen of these contests in which one hundred and one teams from thirty-nine institutions participated.[16] In addition, the Irish Students' Association and the Scottish Union of Students conduct their own preliminaries.

In the American sense of the word, the National Debate Tournament is not a tournament at all. The opposing teams

[12] The Constitution refers to the National Union as a "federal association of Student Unions, Guilds, Junior Common Rooms and Representative Councils of the Universities and University Colleges and Schools or Colleges of similar status of England, Wales and Northern Ireland." Its objects are "to promote the educational, social and general interests of students."

[13] Letter to author, dated April 30, 1958.

[14] From letter from Chairman of Debates, University of Leicester. This method is also used by groups at Southampton University, Nottingham University, Liverpool University, and The University of Hull.

[15] Letter to author.

[16] In 1953-1954, there were sixty-six teams; in 1954-55, 104 teams; and about 100 teams during each of the past three years.

are not matched to debate; members do not deliver constructive and rebuttal speeches; and the competition does not involve round-robin or elimination rounds. In many ways these events resemble what we call extemporaneous speaking contests. The speakers, divided into those for and those against the proposition, assemble in the same room. The presiding officer alternately calls affirmative and negative speakers, each of whom has five minutes (seven minutes in later contests) to present his arguments on the proposition. Members of the teams which I heard presented prepared speeches, but they in no way attempted to advance a case as a team.

In a given contest among representatives from two or three societies, each entering three two-man teams, there is a total of six to nine teams or twelve to eighteen speakers. For example, last year one contest matched speakers from the following London schools: Birkbeck College, Whitelands Training College, and Chelsea Polytechnic. Another involved students from the following Welsh colleges: University College of Bangor, University College of Aberystwith, and Coleg Harlech.[17]

In ranking speakers, the three judges are instructed to consider *content* and *presentation*. The instructions define these qualities as follows:

> The heading of content includes the general cogency of the speech, its relevance to the motion, if it is logically thought out, the way in which it deals with points already made in the debate and the general overall construction of the speech. Under presentation should be considered such things as the style of the speaker, his "listenability," his "telling power," his persuasiveness, his ability to withstand interruptions and reply quickly.[18]

[17] I was fortunate to be present for this debate.

[18] From mimeographed material supplied the author by National Union of Students.

The judges select two teams to advance to the next round. In addition, they may also designate an outstanding individual from the remaining speakers to go forward.

The regional contests take place in January. In England and Wales there have been usually eight or nine of these meets. Last year thirty-two teams from twenty-seven institutions advanced from the preliminaries. In this and following contests, order of speaking and the side to be defended have been determined by lot. The three judges, selected from local members of Parliament, university professors, and prominent citizens, advance one team and one outstanding speaker.

The semi-finals (last year there were three), held in February, involved eight or nine English teams, two Irish teams, two Scottish teams, as well as those individual speakers rated superior. The procedure and judging of these contests are like the earlier rounds.

The two or three best teams advance to the final competition, which during the past two years has been held in May.[19] The finals are given much publicity and are followed with great interest. The judges for the event have been some of the most distinguished persons of the realm.[20]

In the competition, representatives of Glasgow University have been the most successful. After the opening year, when

[19] Letter from Mr. Kenneth Harris of *The Observer*, December 11, 1957.

[20] In 1955 Dr. Arnold Toynbee presided. The judges were Iain MacLeod, Minister of Health; Lady Violet Bonham Carter; Herbert Morrison; and Sir Robert Boothby. In 1956 the panel included John Boyd Carpender, Minister of Pensions; Harold Wilson, former cabinet member of the Labor Government; F. H. Boland, Irish Ambassador; and Joseph Grimond, member of the House of Commons and leader of the Liberal Party. In 1957 the judges included Reginald Mauding, Paymaster General; Harold Wilson, M.P.; and Joseph Grimond. *The Observer*, February 26, 1956; May 19, 1957.

Ruskin College of Oxford University won, the students of Glasgow defeated Bristol University in 1955, Trinity College of Dublin in 1956, and the University College of North Wales in 1957.

However, in 1958 the tide turned against the Scots. A team from Birkbeck College, the evening adult school of the University of London, triumphed over speakers from Glasgow University and from Liverpool University, arguing the proposition "that science is not the enemy of morality." The winners were a twenty-six year old Ph.D. specializing in electronics and a twenty-four year old Anglo-Indian born in Calcutta, who has been reading law for a year. The panel of judges included Dr. Charles Hill, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster; Earl Attlee, former Prime Minister; Clement Davies, former leader of the Liberal Party; S. E. Finer, Professor of Political Institutions at University College of North Staffordshire; and Kenneth Harris, university correspondent for *The Observer*.[21]

The influence of the tournament is difficult to determine. It has created great interest, as is indicated by the number of teams which consistently participated during the last five years. It has probably also increased other types of inter-varsity debating. Many Englishmen, however, consider it undesirable. For example, the Union societies of Oxford and Cambridge, the two most famous debating groups in England, have refused to compete. Kenneth Harris writes that some complain that the tournament is making debating "into a show," a "spectacle," "a game of it," and "Americanizing it."[22]

During my visits to British and Irish debating societies, I found myself on many occasions comparing what I heard with what takes place in our programs. It seemed to me that the student with superior speaking ability had an excellent opportunity to participate in the activities of the societies. Others had to be content with listening. Often the speakers put more emphasis upon cleverness and humor than upon thorough analysis and sound argument.

On the positive side, I found that speakers and listeners manifested considerably more enthusiasm than is evident at most American forensic events. The formalizing influences of the critic judge, timekeeper, and empty chairs were not present to stifle presentations. Instead, the speaker had the inspiration of active listeners, who looked upon themselves as participants in the debates. As a result, the debates I heard were exciting and thought-provoking.

[21] *The Observer*, May 11, 1958.

[22] Letter to author, December 11, 1957. From the first, Kenneth Harris has taken an active interest in this contest. It will be recalled that Harris was a member of the Oxford University team which toured the United States in the fall of 1947. His two colleagues were Anthony Wedgwood-Benn and Sir Edward Boyle. Both of these men are now in Parliament. Following the 1947 tour, Harris wrote *Travelling Tongues, Debating Across America* (London, 1949).

MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SPEECH AND VOICE DISTURBANCES

Emil Froeschels

SOME years ago at a convention of speech therapists, I casually remarked to a woman of prominence in the profession that it was too bad there were so few medical doctors present. She answered with evident emotional resentment: "But this is an independent science!" Whether the emotional reaction stemmed from defense or offense was not of any special interest to me. However, my own reaction, which became expression-ripe some time later, was, What could the words "independent science" mean?

It might be important to study the question with a few practical examples. On the first page of the announcement of the Faculty of Philosophy 1956-1957 of Columbia University, under the heading Faculty of Science, are mentioned among others, anatomy, astronomy, biochemistry, botany, chemistry, engineering, geology, and mathematics. Anatomy and astronomy seem to be independent of each other. But recently it seems to have been demonstrated statistically that more feeble-minded children are born in the first four months of the year than in the other months. Does it not seem that anatomy is less independent of astronomy than one may have believed? The interconnection seems on the same basis of observation to hold also for astronomy, botany, and biochemistry (and therefore chemistry). Astronomy and geology have been interconnected ever since geology started. Mathematics, the science that has puzzled many great thinkers because it seems to be independent of observation of facts (although Mach and others contradicted this opinion!), is so intrinsically connected with all sciences, not only those which deal with statistics but also the practical sciences like engineering and chemistry, that interdependence rather than independence is obvious. (Kant even stated that any science is a science only to the degree in which it contains mathematics.) Is engineering independent of anatomy and physiology? Constructors of houses, roads, and bridges have to take anatomy and physiology into serious consideration. One cannot exhaust all the different sciences in a brief paper. Let me refer to only a few more examples.

Modern psychiatry is partly based on psychology, and vice-versa. So are all other branches of medicine, as proved by what is called psychosomatic. The famous indeterminacy law of Heisenberg unfortunately seems to rule also part of medicine, namely prognosis. We do not know all the conditions present in any case, and therefore our prognosis is based on probability (indeterminacy).

So, finally, what can the term "independent science" mean semantically, if it means anything? I believe the term may refer to single parts of a certain curriculum, to single parts, for other parts may be common to other curriculums. The last part of the foregoing sentence, on the other hand, seems to

Dr. Froeschels is a physician who for many years has given much attention to speech disturbances and has published extensively on the subject.

speak more for interdependence than for independence. Certainly the term independent science refers to degrees that a university or a college has the right to bestow upon qualified students. I doubt whether this formality justifies the term in the sense in which our therapist used it.

Anyway, it seems to me that she wanted to express her opinion that there is no connection between the medical branch of logopedics and—now, I am at a loss—the (should I call it?) psychological branch? The medical logopedists certainly do not neglect psychology. They, as a matter of fact, try to learn and to use the results of investigations of cases of speech and/or voice disturbances resulting from the independent work of anybody seriously interested and sufficiently informed about logopedics, especially the work of the psychologists. Is that attitude reciprocated? It is to a high degree by some non-medical logopedists. Unfortunately, such collaboration among medical and non-medical experts is not the general rule. The International Society for Speech and Voice Science and The New York Society for Speech and Voice Therapy are bodies formed from both groups. Other non-medical branches working on speech and voice disturbances are covered by the names "speech teachers, speech-voice therapists or correctionists and/or pathologists." In these groups also the tendency toward cooperation with medical experts is hardly universal.

To investigate whether collaboration is evident I surveyed papers published in the last five and one-half years (1952 to the middle of 1957) in the *Folia Phoniatrica* and in *The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*.[1] I found 84 papers written by physicians (two dental surgeons) and 85 papers written by non-medical experts. By far the great majority of the medical papers (69) appeared in the *Folia Phoniatrica*. Only 15 appeared in the *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*. The outlook of the *Folia* editor and the editors of *The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* seems to be very different. On the basis of subject-matter I used a four-fold grouping: 1) therapeutic contributions; 2) clinical observations, meaning by that term description of signs and symptoms of speech and voice disturbances and somatic and psychologic signs connected with them; 3) experimental phonetics and tests; 4) psychologic contributions to the questions of some reasons underlying the disturbances.

	Medical papers 84	Non-medical papers 85
1	19	14
2	44	21
3	16	35
4	5	15

So, 75% of the medical papers dealt with therapeutics and clinical observations as contrasted with 41% in the non-medical articles. Experimental phonetics, testing, and psychology amounted to 25% in the first as compared with 59% in the second group.

It seems to me that those figures indicate the prevailing interests in the respective groups. An attempt to explain the underlying reasons for the differences between the two groups will certainly meet with considerable difficulties. I have to admit that my very frequent dealing with these problems so far has resulted in only one thought. Before reporting this thought I want to stress that this paper is meant to be a point of departure for a discussion and not a final answer.

[1] In addition I surveyed single issues of both periodicals, choosing at random from one or two years preceding 1952.

I believe that the curriculums of the physicians and of the non-medical therapists are to a certain degree responsible. We medical people are taught, though of course not exclusively, to face emergency situations, and I feel that such situations finally influence our *whole* therapeutic work. In other words, whatever kind of disease we are facing we feel impelled to do our utmost *at every moment* to help overcome the trouble. On the other hand I believe that the curriculum of the psychologist leads him primarily toward *inquiries* about the underlying or the accompanying sources. That does not mean, of course, that he is not aware of his responsibilities as a therapist. But, I believe that he by his curriculum is convinced that the more he explores the psychologic facts the better he will be prepared for offering the treatment.

On the other hand the physician will not neglect the psychologic forces participating in the clinical picture. Yet his *primary* impetus will push him, so to say, toward the attempt at healing. He is only too well aware of being forced to work as a healer without knowing many facts that underlie the disease and form the clinical picture. At the same time this awareness will spur him on to learn as much as possible about the unexplained facts. He will therefore welcome the investigations of the psychologist.

Under the second heading in my statistics, "Clinical observations," I want to draw attention to two subjects, namely stuttering and voice disturbances. The symptomatology of stuttering has been, as I believe, described thoroughly in many papers written by my students and myself.[2] They show that the clinical picture of this speech impediment develops step by step in every case congruently. Within the single step a choice of many different signs is open to the single patient so that no two stutterers show exactly the same signs. All kinds of accompanying movements of the "clonic" and/or "tonic" type appear except that only one clonic sign *never* shows, the trembling of the eye-balls (nystagmus), although the "tonic" accompanying movements of the eye-balls, looking to one side or up or down, are almost a universal sign in the cases of developed stuttering. Why does just nystagmus not show? Because all the other "clonic" or "tonic" signs can be made voluntarily but not nystagmus. From these observations I made the conclusion that only those signs that can be made voluntarily (subconsciously) form the clinical picture of stuttering. Is it not obvious that clinical observations made from a medical viewpoint may help the psychological procedure? One of the observations which in my opinion is decisive for the entity of stuttering and therefore for every theory of the basis of the trouble is the fact that *no patient ever stutters at the end of a word.* Why not? If stuttering were, as some writers have said, a relapse into the oral aggressive period of babyhood, why no sign at the end of the word? At the end of many single acts of sucking the baby grasps the nipple firmly with the lips in order to press out some more milk. In my opinion, the reason for stuttering never appearing at the end of a word is that the patient constantly, though with new signs, repeats the mistake he made when he as a child (3-6 years) iterated syllables or words, these iterations being just fillers of a gap because a following word was not yet in his mind. If the child or his environment mistakes those iterations for speech difficulties, the

[2] E. Froeschels, "The Core of Stuttering," *Acta Otolaryngologica, XLV* (1955), 2.

child begins to believe in speech difficulties and uses excess energy in the muscles, so creating the "clonotonic," "tonoclonic" clinical signs. If lack of normally developed brain dominance for speech were the cause of stuttering, why then do many stutterers during a weakening disease speak normally? Furthermore, why, according to European statistics, is there a smaller percent of stutterers in the schools for retarded children than in the schools for normal children? Just the opposite would be expected if a neurologic inferiority were the basis for the development of stuttering from the pure clonic to the tonoclonic and tonic state. I cannot go into all the theories. All I wanted to show is that theories not based on exact clinical observations may easily go astray.

Furthermore without thorough appreciation of the symptomatology, therapeutic procedures may not be sufficiently evaluated. To mention only one example: In Travis' *Handbook of Speech Pathology*,[3] Van Riper describes his "cancellation" therapy. Had he mentioned the well described symptomatology of imitation stuttering,[4] I believe he could have found some help for the deeper understanding of the influence of "cancellation."

Of course nobody should ignore the possibility that stuttering may be "imbedded" into primary existing nervous troubles or tendencies and may in its detrimental social implications help to develop new nervous symptoms. However, if one neglects the primary source of the trouble which can be understood by exact clinical observations, one may easily develop a theory and from that a treatment which will never hit the point. We are all aware of the fact that many therapists base their treatment of stuttering on the premise that a complete cure is impossible, and so the patient has to be reconciled somehow to living with the stuttering. From a medical viewpoint it would not be logical to conclude that failure of some cases to respond 100% to a treatment to which other cases had responded 100% proves that all cases should be handled as though they are incurable. Medical as well as lay people also know that even with the most efficient medication or surgery the recovery or cure of a patient is influenced by a factor present in the patient's attitude called, in extreme terms, "the will to live." The knowledge that he can be cured is certainly of great value to the patient as well as to the doctor. On the other hand a doctor knows that the fact that many cases of a certain malady have responded 100% to a specific treatment does not guarantee that all cases will respond accordingly.

As to voice troubles, the attempt at localizing them within the breathing mechanism, the larynx, the pharynx, and the mouth gives us a hint to the nature of the impediments.[5] Expressions such as shrill, metallic, nasal, etc. lack any real guiding help toward an understanding of the nature of the disturbances, and, therefore, are of little if any assistance in finding the correct approach to help the patient. However, I do not intend to go into detail here about the exact diagnosis of voice troubles. The discussion of the symptomatology of stuttering will, I hope, suffice to demonstrate the importance of the exact clinical symptomatology for the evaluation of the nature of any disease and of the appropriate treatment.

[3] (New York, 1957), pp. 889 ff.

[4] E. Froeschels, "Imitation Stuttering," *Folia Phoniatrica*, VI (1954), 3.

[5] E. Froeschels, "Laws in the Appearance and the Development of Voice-Hyperfunctions," *The Journal of Speech Disorders*, V (1948), 1.

Points 3 and 4 of my table seem to me not to ask for a more elaborate discussion because they are, at least to a great extent, covered by what is said above about the different curriculums. However, as another testimony to the many interests shared by the medical and non-medical groups the reader may be reminded of publications on experimental phonetics written by physicians, for example E. Scripture, H. Gutzmann, and myself (with D. Weiss and L. Hajek).

The more insight into any disease is achieved the greater the hope for an appropriate treatment. Therefore any therapist will also welcome the investigations of the psychologist. The final conclusion I have to make in this paper is the necessity for close collaboration of the medical and the non-medical speech voice therapists. Such close collaboration will serve best the needs of the patient. Whatever the reaction of the reader may be, I wish the conspicuous numerical difference in the kinds of topics chosen by the two groups of writers would be kept seriously in mind.

• • •

ON TALKING A NEW LANGUAGE

W. Norwood Brigance

FOR over three centuries, roughly until the end of World War II, our Western civilization had been living in what we called "the modern world." It was a world created by the Renaissance, a world pioneered by men like Erasmus, Galileo, Hobbes, Kepler, Harvey, Pascal, Locke, and Newton. During the century in which these men lived most of the leading ideas and beliefs that influence our lives today took their modern form. In government, the struggle for freedom of speech, trial by jury, right of *habeas corpus*, freedom of press, freedom of religion and of man's conscience—all these began to take their modern form some 300 years ago. In science, the foundations were laid by Kepler, Newton, and others on which the twentieth century built. Even in business, current economic theory and practice had many of its foundations laid down some 300 years ago—in vexing problems that still vex us today, like creeping inflation, currency control, government deficits, tariff, and foreign trade.

Now, the concepts we used to describe this modern world, and the language, came mainly from one man: René Descartes. It was Descartes who reapportioned and redefined old terms, reoriented and reorganized them, and gave them modern meanings. Of his *Discourse on Method*, Leon Roth said: "It is the dividing line in the history of thought. Everything that came before it is old; everything that came after it is new." As a result, until around 1940 an educated man of 300 years ago could still understand an educated man of today, and still be able to make himself understood; for the language both used was the language of Descartes.

Mr. Brigance (Ph.D., Iowa, 1930) is Chairman of the Department of Speech at Wabash College and is a former Editor of QJS *and President of the SAA.*

But since 1940—or we could say since World War II—we have been moving with high speed toward a new view of the world to replace the old one we had been using for 300 years. It is as if the atom bomb not only had thrust us into a new age of energy, but also into a new age of concepts; and this new age of concepts is forcing us to speak in a new language.

2.

Look first at physics. Descartes' world was made up of matter in motion; and motion was explained and measured as though it were made up of an infinite number of infinitely small, but actually static "stills." Even *time* was not continuous. Instead, each moment of time was separated from neighboring moments as a succession of discrete instants. That was the concept of Descartes and Newton, and that was the concept I was taught in physics about 1913. That is not the concept today, for physicists today see *matter* as a special form of *energy* in which *motion*, *mass*, and continuous *time* are involved. But in talking about these new concepts they have had to discard an old vocabulary and to learn a new one.

Even the mathematics which the

physicist uses is developing a new language. Today solid geometry and trigonometry are disappearing as separate subjects, and the barriers are crumbling between algebra, geometry, and analysis. Some mathematicians still talk in the old Cartesian language. In fact, most high-school mathematics teachers still do. But modern mathematicians talk a new language. To them even a line is no longer the shortest distance between two points. It is now a set of points. At my institution when high-school graduates enter as college freshmen they run abruptly into what they think is trouble with mathematics. Actually their trouble is less with mathematics than with language. Even if they have had high-school trigonometry, its emphasis was usually on surveying and navigation. Not only has their freshman college mathematics been changed in name from trigonometry and college algebra to "analysis," but it has also been changed in many of its concepts. Now it includes the theory of sets, symbolic logic, and mathematical systems. To think in these new concepts our freshmen must learn a new language, different from the one they used in high school. When they complain of trouble with mathematics, actually they are usually having trouble with language.

Next, look at psychology. Descartes set up a dual world—one of body, the other of mind. Mind dealt with *intellect* and *reason*. It operated on a different set of principles from body. Psychologists used this language almost entirely until about 1910, and most of them for many years after. In terms of such language education was a *mental* process. Now psychologists have given up the mind-body dualism. They say that you cannot separate the human mind from human behavior. They say further that learning is not "mental" but is a process that involves the whole organism. Unfortunately they have never been able to agree on what the thing we once called "mind" really is. They know it is a complex form of behavior which involves the neural system, body, and vocal cords; but each school of psychologists has a different concept about the exact process. As a result we have become entangled in the *will, urge, set, Gestalt,* and even Freud's *libido.*

This has led to a lively conflict in education, part of which comes from two groups of educators talking to each other in two languages. During the past ten years traditional educators have attacked the public schools with unceasing fury. I have noted some twenty-five books and two hundred articles in which they have carried on this attack. They write almost entirely in the old Cartesian language. Education, they say, has lost its "mental discipline" and its "intellectual values." The trouble here is that modern educators do not even think in those terms. According to their concepts there is no such thing as "mind," or "mental discipline," or "intellectual values." According to their concepts education comes from (1) motivation, (2) learning, and (3) retention. In short, according to their concepts, Robert Hutchins, Whitney Griswold, and Arthur Bestor are talking in a dead language.

Where does that leave us? Physicists says there is no "matter." Psychologists say there is no "mind." One wit has summarized it well: "No matter, never mind."

In economics we have also developed new concepts and have begun to talk in a new language. As an undergraduate student I acquired 32 hours of credit in economics. I studied about *capital* and *labor,* and learned that prices were

determined by *supply* and *demand*. But I never heard of *management, administered prices, concentrated industries, commodity credit, gross national product,* or even of *disposable* personal income. These are new concepts and new terms. As I read those who discuss economic problems today they are in serious language trouble. Those "16 revolutions" of the twentieth century have changed the nature of government and business, and changed their relation to each other. Electronics and automation have made corporations bigger than old governments of the past. The role of government has been revolutionized—in supplying information on which business bases plans, in shaping the policies of money and credit, in stabilizing the economy. Yet writers and even a few economists still talk about new concepts in old terms: *big business, monopolies, government interference,* and *the welfare state*. These old terms prevent their thinking in new concepts.

In speech, of course, we could not escape language trouble, for we deal with language per se. One aspect of our trouble you hear every week over that delightful television program *The Last Word* in the conversation between Bergen Evans and John Mason Brown. Brown worries about *grammar*. Evans is concerned with *communication*. Grammar is a concept of the *parts* of speech, dear to the world of Descartes. Communication looks at the whole *process* of speech: what is said, to whom, under what conditions, and in what frame of reference. It may even concern itself with what is not said, and why.

Here is the essential difference between the world of Descartes and the world of today. In the world of Descartes the whole was the sum of its parts. It had to be, for the Cartesian world was mechanical. It was static. But in the new view of the world that has been emerging since about 1940, perhaps the greatest single departure from the old concepts lies in our understanding that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. For the whole adds *process,* what the physicists call "energy" and what the psychologists call "function." These new concepts—whether in science, economics, psychology, language, or any other—recognize growth, development, dynamism. They postulate that energy rather than mass is the basic principle of all phenomena, and that what we used to call "matter" and "mind" are merely special forms of energy.

This explains why in speech *grammar* is no longer a basic concept. It explains why *communication*—in spite of the disdain of our older members, along with the Cartesian-minded members of the Modern Language Association—has become the new concept. Communication does not deal with static subject matter, nor with the parts of speech, but with its whole process.

Especially it explains why we are forced to give up the old idea that areas of learning are static bundles of knowledge, and that we can tie them into separate packages known as history, English, psychology, economics, and physics.

3.

Now this has a direct personal impact on every teacher of speech, for in the old Cartesian world college courses and departments were evaluated by their "content." In that world if a course or department had no "content" it was not respectable in the academic world, and indeed it did not belong. Teachers of speech thirty years ago were accused by entrenched educators of offering courses without "subject matter." They usually defended themselves by denying the indictment and presenting their

physicist uses is developing a new language. Today solid geometry and trigonometry are disappearing as separate subjects, and the barriers are crumbling between algebra, geometry, and analysis. Some mathematicians still talk in the old Cartesian language. In fact, most high-school mathematics teachers still do. But modern mathematicians talk a new language. To them even a line is no longer the shortest distance between two points. It is now a set of points. At my institution when high-school graduates enter as college freshmen they run abruptly into what they think is trouble with mathematics. Actually their trouble is less with mathematics than with language. Even if they have had high-school trigonometry, its emphasis was usually on surveying and navigation. Not only has their freshman college mathematics been changed in name from trigonometry and college algebra to "analysis," but it has also been changed in many of its concepts. Now it includes the theory of sets, symbolic logic, and mathematical systems. To think in these new concepts our freshmen must learn a new language, different from the one they used in high school. When they complain of trouble with mathematics, actually they are usually having trouble with language.

Next, look at psychology. Descartes set up a dual world—one of body, the other of mind. Mind dealt with *intellect* and *reason*. It operated on a different set of principles from body. Psychologists used this language almost entirely until about 1910, and most of them for many years after. In terms of such language education was a *mental* process. Now psychologists have given up the mind-body dualism. They say that you cannot separate the human mind from human behavior. They say further that learning is not "mental" but is a process that involves the whole organism. Unfortunately they have never been able to agree on what the thing we once called "mind" really is. They know it is a complex form of behavior which involves the neural system, body, and vocal cords; but each school of psychologists has a different concept about the exact process. As a result we have become entangled in the *will, urge, set, Gestalt,* and even Freud's *libido.*

This has led to a lively conflict in education, part of which comes from two groups of educators talking to each other in two languages. During the past ten years traditional educators have attacked the public schools with unceasing fury. I have noted some twenty-five books and two hundred articles in which they have carried on this attack. They write almost entirely in the old Cartesian language. Education, they say, has lost its "mental discipline" and its "intellectual values." The trouble here is that modern educators do not even think in those terms. According to their concepts there is no such thing as "mind," or "mental discipline," or "intellectual values." According to their concepts education comes from (1) motivation, (2) learning, and (3) retention. In short, according to their concepts, Robert Hutchins, Whitney Griswold, and Arthur Bestor are talking in a dead language.

Where does that leave us? Physicists says there is no "matter." Psychologists say there is no "mind." One wit has summarized it well: "No matter, never mind."

In economics we have also developed new concepts and have begun to talk in a new language. As an undergraduate student I acquired 32 hours of credit in economics. I studied about *capital* and *labor*, and learned that prices were

determined by *supply* and *demand*. But I never heard of *management, administered prices, concentrated industries, commodity credit, gross national product,* or even of *disposable* personal income. These are new concepts and new terms. As I read those who discuss economic problems today they are in serious language trouble. Those "16 revolutions" of the twentieth century have changed the nature of government and business, and changed their relation to each other. Electronics and automation have made corporations bigger than old governments of the past. The role of government has been revolutionized—in supplying information on which business bases plans, in shaping the policies of money and credit, in stabilizing the economy. Yet writers and even a few economists still talk about new concepts in old terms: *big business, monopolies, government interference,* and *the welfare state*. These old terms prevent their thinking in new concepts.

In speech, of course, we could not escape language trouble, for we deal with language per se. One aspect of our trouble you hear every week over that delightful television program *The Last Word* in the conversation between Bergen Evans and John Mason Brown. Brown worries about *grammar*. Evans is concerned with *communication*. Grammar is a concept of the *parts* of speech, dear to the world of Descartes. Communication looks at the whole *process* of speech: what is said, to whom, under what conditions, and in what frame of reference. It may even concern itself with what is not said, and why.

Here is the essential difference between the world of Descartes and the world of today. In the world of Descartes the whole was the sum of its parts. It had to be, for the Cartesian world was mechanical. It was static. But in the new view of the world that has been emerging since about 1940, perhaps the greatest single departure from the old concepts lies in our understanding that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. For the whole adds *process*, what the physicists call "energy" and what the psychologists call "function." These new concepts—whether in science, economics, psychology, language, or any other—recognize growth, development, dynamism. They postulate that energy rather than mass is the basic principle of all phenomena, and that what we used to call "matter" and "mind" are merely special forms of energy.

This explains why in speech *grammar* is no longer a basic concept. It explains why *communication*—in spite of the disdain of our older members, along with the Cartesian-minded members of the Modern Language Association—has become the new concept. Communication does not deal with static subject matter, nor with the parts of speech, but with its whole process.

Especially it explains why we are forced to give up the old idea that areas of learning are static bundles of knowledge, and that we can tie them into separate packages known as history, English, psychology, economics, and physics.

3.

Now this has a direct personal impact on every teacher of speech, for in the old Cartesian world college courses and departments were evaluated by their "content." In that world if a course or department had no "content" it was not respectable in the academic world, and indeed it did not belong. Teachers of speech thirty years ago were accused by entrenched educators of offering courses without "subject matter." They usually defended themselves by denying the indictment and presenting their

claims to having respectable "subject matter." On both sides, "subject matter" and "content" were criteria of respectability, as indeed they must be to those living in the world of Descartes.

But in the new view of the world "subject matter" and "content" are terms that no longer fit our level of thinking; and the subject-matter educators who once insisted that speech was not respectable because it had no "content" belong to the old world of Descartes. They may linger on in this new world now emerging, but they are no longer intellectual citizens. In the post-Cartesian world, "content" is not the basic concept. The basic concept is *process, growth, development, dynamism* in which speech stands as a core. Looking back we can see that the field of speech in the 1920's and 1930's was doing to education what Einstein's formula did for the scientific world, namely applying the idea of function. It demonstrated that the whole was more than the sum of its parts.

The purpose in pointing this out, however, is not for self congratulation. It is to emphasize a special duty that teachers of speech face in the half century ahead. This new world in which we live, like the world of Locke and Newton, is changing under the impact of new discoveries and new concepts. We must teach students to discuss these new discoveries and concepts, discuss them intelligently, effectively, and responsibly.

We are going to have trouble on two fronts. First, in these various fields of human thought we have now reached a maddening confusion of tongues. Each field has developed its own new language. When we try to find a common language to communicate from one group to another, we are usually forced to fall back on the outworn Cartesian language. But this language caused the confusion in the first place and now only increases it.

As a result, physicians tell me they have almost given up trying to explain anything to their patients. Scientists have trouble explaining even to Congress what they are doing with money appropriated for missile defense, until one Senator groaned, "It sounds like unscrewing the inscrutible." Economists drag their listeners over dollar pools and tariff walls. In 1930 speech scientists could sit in a conference and talk to other speech teachers. By 1950 the two could no longer understand each other, even when they talked about meeting together in one convention. So today we meet in separate conventions.

This is only the beginning. We face also a second problem. During the next half century this world in transition will be groping for more new concepts and more new terms with which to communicate them. We shall likely be living in a confusion of tongues like that described as following the fall of the Tower of Babel. On us—not us alone, but us among others—rests the obligation to do for this Neo-Modern World what Descartes did for his, namely to develop a language to communicate its new concepts. It will not be a language that repudiates the Cartesian view of the world, but one that carries forward our thinking to higher levels.

So look forward, my lords and ladies, to a strenuous half-century ahead. You will endure students who talk nonsense by using the old language to obscure new concepts. You will endure more Bestors, Hutchinses, and Griswolds, who will continue to lament in the old language the emergence of a new world. And you may live to see a common language develop whereby people of different disciplines can communicate with one another.

THE FORUM

EDITORIAL MID-TERM

This number of *QJS* opens the second half of the term of the present editorial board. After six months of refuge in the thought that the next deadline was off in the distance somewhere, we stagger into a quick succession of four numbers for the current academic year. Then another rustication, our valedictory numbers, and a new set of editorial names and prejudices.

So far we contemplate no significant changes in policy for 1958-1959. We have a sufficient supply of good manuscripts to keep us, for the moment, safe from deadline jitters. As usual, of course, the distribution of manuscripts among the several fields of our province is disproportionate; but, always allowing for the prior claim of the more specialized journals, we think that the distribution of manuscripts we receive probably represents fairly the emphasis in learned and critical writing among the scholars and teachers whom we serve.

The editor has been gratified to observe some increasing tendency for readers to mount the Forum for salutary controversy. Such letters as Robert T. Oliver's below not only let us know that we are being read, but help clear the litter, to good advantage, off cluttered if touchy issues of some consequence. Letters of scholarly correction and reproof, such as John C. McLaughlin's in our April number, are especially relevant and welcome.

Changes of Address

Over the summer, members of the editorial board have found themselves on the move—some to new positions and new addresses effective this fall.

As Associate Editor Murphy reports in detail in SHOP TALK (below, pp. 344-345), the Editorial Office is now accommodated in the Department of Speech at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, where the Editor has joined the faculty as Professor of Speech. Associate Editor Robert G. Gunderson has moved to the Department of Speech, Indiana University, Bloomington, whence he carries on as editor of NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW. C. K. Thomas, our associate editor for phonetics, has terminated a long career at Cornell University to join the Department of Speech at the University of Florida, Gainesville.

Because of the Editor's move, he and *QJS* have lost the notable service of Penny Brown (Mrs. D. Tyner), the expert secretary and editorial assistant who has served *QJS* for the past year. As might be expected, Mrs. Brown chose her husband and children in St. Louis rather than the Editor in Iowa City. We have also lost the service of Miss Kathryn Baker as proofreader, invaluable help which we have appreciated greatly.

While mentioning moves, furthermore, let us call attention to the domestic circumstance that *QJS* now shares a secretary with *ETJ*. James H. Clancy, editor of *ETJ*, also joined the faculty of the State University of Iowa this fall, as Professor of Dramatic Art. From residential contiguity and secretarial community we anticipate no editorial collision.

D.C.B.

TODAY'S SPEECH REVISITED

To the Editor:

Our highly respected colleague, Barney Baskerville, has raised a question of such fundamental significance in his review of *Today's Speech* (*QJS*, April 1958) that I think he would be deeply disturbed if it were passed by without further discussion in these pages. I shall refer only reluctantly, and purely for illustrative purposes, to the quality of the articles which appear in *TS*; yet it is precisely this question of quality which is the nub of the question Barney has raised.

The problem which really demands our most thoughtful consideration is this: *Can we popularize our concepts of rhetoric without debasing them?* The subsidiary problem, scarcely less important, is: *As educators do we have any duty to try to educate those who are not enrolled in our classes?* (Indeed, I cannot escape a fear that unconsciously and to an extent that he himself does not, of course, realize, Barney reveals a reluctance to try to educate any who have not actually earned professional status by graduate work in our field. And this, I submit, is not at all an uncommon state of mind. Notoriously, writers of textbooks in all fields, and even more so, writers of articles for professional journals, tend very strongly to write for their compeers, rather than for those who stand in need of the elements of their subject matter.)

Can rhetoric be popularized without being debased? If the question did not essentially answer itself, we should have to close up shop as educators. For all education is an attempt to bring understanding to people who stand in need of it—in short, who lack it. This was the "common ground" of the views held by Thorne and Irvin (as they eventually discovered) in the series of their articles on "teaching" versus "salesmanship."

Is there an impassable gulf existing between "town and gown"? Do we have to teach on campus in a manner that is ineffective off campus—and vice versa? Dr. Baskerville, with the best will in the world (and he very thoughtfully exercised great tactfulness in his critique), appears to lend the weight of his own testimony to the view that the proper concern of the campus is with ethical intellectuality and that the real concern of the business world is with sophistical practicality. (For the benefit of those who have not been "educated" this last phrase means, in effect, "anything to make a fast buck.")

Now, my hunch is that certain of our readers may have cringed a bit in reading the phrase that concludes the paragraph above. These same readers may have felt an impropriety in the references to our colleague as "Barney," rather than with his full name and title. These are two instances of popularization by stylistic devices. Other examples, from titles published in *Today's Speech*, are: "How to Be Important without Being Impossible," "A Stage Fright Sufferer Strikes Back," "Our Tongue-Tied Democracy," "Pundits or Parrots," and "How to Argue with a Red-Headed Woman."

In the same issue in which all but one of the above titles were published (and I think any issue would serve a similar illustrative purpose) one article begins: "The dinner was finished. The cigars were lit. The speaker of the evening was in full swing." The writer's earnest endeavor was to lead his readers to a consideration for the need of "internal, rather than external, humor" when they compose an entertaining speech. Another article commences, "Conversation in this country has fallen upon evil days."

Popular, yes—but it is written by the highly respected President of Yale, who tries to intrigue his readers to consider the proposition that true education is "conversation about wisdom." Still another article in that same issue is in the form of a play, with such characters as Dean Able, Professor Platteau, and Professor Kickerow—and its high-minded purpose is to inveigle readers into a serious consideration of the ends of rhetoric. "How to Argue with a Red-Headed Woman," incidentally, gets closer to the essential problem of genuine persuasion than any of the solemn, professionally abstruse, and properly foot-noted articles that I have read recently on the subject.

Except for the necessity of illustration, it would be carrying the real point of this discussion astray to so much as mention *Today's Speech*—though, as its editor, I take great delight in doing so. The real point is whether as professional educators we have a positive duty to try to educate as many as possible, and not the chosen few. If the answer is "Yes, educate, but not debase," then the sharp edge of the query would be turned squarely toward the pages of our journal, and the answer would have to be sought by a thoughtful reading of all we have published in it. Of course, it would be a great personal satisfaction to me if every member of the SAA would do so. Many, though not all, of the back issues are still in stock and may be purchased for the small price of $5.00—current subscription, $1.50 annually.

If the question really means, is it possible to popularize education without debasing it? then we are seriously in need of self-examination for even finding the impulse within ourselves to raise such a question at all. As teachers we strive earnestly to popularize every time we labor through lecture or conference to convey to not-too-bright students such simple concepts as how to organize, or illustrate, or prove, or adapt, etc. Now if any readers of this commentary are predisposed to look for errors in my hypothesis, they may at this point exclaim to themselves, "But, ah, that is the point! This is precisely where the difference lies in our points of view! Such concepts as have been listed are not, in truth, 'simple' at all, but every one of them is, when properly understood, vastly complex. And when that complexity is ignored for the sake of popularization, then is when debasement occurs."

At this point I must sigh a bit wearily and urge my eager readers not to plague an old war-horse with reminder that in the hot course of battle there are wounds to be endured, strategies to be worked out, tactics to be pursued, problems of co-ordination, communication, and supply to be solved, etc., etc. As the writer of a number of textbooks and not a few academic articles, I can appreciate the painful sense a scholar has in confronting the points at which some limiting factor (space, the patience of his readers, his own knowledge) imposes the necessity of concluding the process of analytic discrimination. But as a working classroom teacher (and, I confess happily, as one who has also had the challenging pleasure of teaching a number of groups off campus), I am also aware that when John or Susie asks, "Professor, how can I *do* it?" there is merit in having the ability to give a comprehensible, simple, plain, and practical answer. This is true even if you are tempted after the conference ends to turn to your colleague seated at the next desk and remark on the pain of confronting the communicative necessity by adapting your own completeness of understanding to the incomplete but

urgent need and comprehending limitations of the student.

The basic question which friend Baskerville has raised is of such far-reaching import that I hope our profession will give a great deal of continuing attention to it. I fear that I have herewith utilized all the space I should be allowed. Let me end, though, with one more earnest injunction: *Please,* don't let us, as a profession, drift into a sense of being so essentially removed from our social community that talking to businessmen must, *ipso facto,* be at least indiscreet, if not (my dear) actually immoral. The truth of the matter is that a great number of them are eager to come to us, as nearly on our terms as their education permits. The whole tradition of rhetoric, it seems to me, demands that we make an effort, on our own part, to try to meet them halfway.

ROBERT T. OLIVER
EDITOR, *Today's Speech*
The Pennsylvania State University

P.S. There is one more point of such transcendent importance that I have left it for the position of emphasis, in a postscript. This is the doubt, very delicately expressed by Dr. Baskerville, whether our own on-campus undergraduate students might not be undernourished intellectually by the "popularization" of many of our articles. The simple fact is that the great majority of the articles develop in some detail items that textbooks, by necessity, can deal with only very briefly and that often are not even mentioned in classroom lectures. For example, in the latest (September 1958) issue there are two articles on impromptu speaking—with a serious effort to teach students the limitations, requirements, and methods of this frequently-encountered type of speaking. Instances could be multiplied. No matter what textbook is used, *Today's Speech* will enrich and enlarge the rhetorical principles and methods for its student-readers. For it speaks to them, not over their heads to their professors.

To the Editor:

In the foregoing letter and postscript, Professor Oliver has posed two basic questions and has provided very persuasive answers. He answers each of his questions enthusiastically in the affirmative, implying that I have stated the negative case, which he here wishes to refute. It is a pity to spoil what may appear to be the makings of a good debate, but I must protest that we are really on the same side. "Can we popularize rhetoric without debasing it?" Of course we can, and as Professor Oliver says, as teachers we must. (Incidentally, I went out of my way in the review to disavow any quarrel with popularization *per se,* and to applaud honest attempts to deflate pedantic pomposity.) "Should we try to educate those who are not enrolled in college classes?" Of course we should, though perhaps we should pause to define what we mean by education. (One would have thought the question unnecessary, for most of us pedagogues have so much didacticism in our blood stream that we instinctively try to teach anyone who comes within range.) It seems to me, therefore, that the point of which Professor Oliver has made an issue—namely, the necessity for popularization of knowledge—is in this case no issue at all.

But, as Professor Oliver knows, there is popularization and popularization. The source of my concern, as I tried to indicate in the review, is partly a matter of tone and of emphasis. More important, however, is the matter of funda-

mental values. Can a journal written for college undergraduates (or for businessmen either, as far as that goes) afford to convey the impression that this much-abused and much-misunderstood discipline called "Speech" is concerned primarily with imparting techniques and perfecting mechanisms for selling our personalities, our ideas, or our employers' products, regardless of whether those personalities, ideas, or products are worth buying? I don't think this is our fundamental purpose, and I don't believe Professor Oliver thinks so either. But a college undergraduate, fed on a diet of breezy how-to-do-it pieces, may be misled into believing that with dash, zip, and a handful of sure-fire techniques, "you too can. . . ." As Professor Karl Wallace has warned us, it is easy to become so preoccupied with processes, operations, and techniques, as to lose interest in the character of the communicator and the quality of the communicative product. There is no sly suggestion here that the Editor of *Today's Speech* or his contributors have done this; I merely call attention to the potential danger in an over-emphasis on techniques.

It has been a long uphill fight to establish speech as a vital part of the liberal arts curriculum, and the fight is not won yet. We have been trying to convince our colleagues in other fields that we are allied with them in what I take to be the true purpose of a university, the discovery and communication of truth. We think we have a contribution to make in teaching students (and businessmen, if you wish) to think—to evaluate evidence, to distinguish good reasoning from bad, to appraise the integrity of both means and ends—so that they may find the truth for themselves; and then to make their thoughts effective through speech. I am anxious that our official journals present us in this role of seeking to give effectiveness to truth, rather than merely giving effectiveness to the speaker.

This, I think, need not preclude popularization. But we must be sure we are popularizing the right things.

BARNET BASKERVILLE
University of Washington

INTERPRETATION—CHANT OR RANT?

To the Editor:

In her recent fine review (October 1957), Marie Hochmuth explained Yvor Winters' theory of poetry reading. As she explains, he feels "that adequate audible reading must be 'reading in which the rhythm of the poem is rendered intact, without the sacrifice of any other element.' To Winters, 'a poem in the very nature of the case is a formal statement; and the reading of a poem is thus a formal occasion. A poem is not conversation; neither is it drama.' Accordingly, 'A formal reading which avoids dramatic declamation will necessarily take on something of the nature of a chant.'" Having recently heard Mr. Winters read a group of his own poems in the manner suggested by his theory, I think there is something drastically wrong with both his theory and his practice. Only those who have never heard him could agree with either. His mournful chanting of every poem in precisely the same way turns them all into the same poem. It does anything but render the rhythm of the poem intact "without the sacrifice of any other element." Everything is sacrificed to the monotonous drone. His chant becomes a dramatic pose which is as destructive of the poems he is reading as are the dramatic declamations he so vitriolically opposes.

Of course, in opposing the acting

approach to the oral reading of poetry, Winters has a valid point. Most oral interpretation teachers know that all forms of literature are in some sense dramatic. Some of them erroneously jump from this fact to the conclusion that literature, therefore, can be presented only through acting conventions. This conclusion in turn becomes part of the baggage of ideas which their students carry away with them. Ask these students to differentiate between acting and oral interpretation, and what answers do you get? The interpreter is like a restrained actor. Interpretation is a limited form of acting. The interpreter is at a disadvantage over the actor, who can use broad gestures, costumes, sets, and makeup.

Behind such answers is the assumption that oral interpretation is a weak imitation of acting. Students who accept this position find themselves trying to act when they should be reading. They handle dialogue easily, but find themselves at a complete loss when faced with a lyric poem or descriptive narration.

Oral interpretation is no more a weak imitation of acting than the theatre is a weak imitation of the movies. Each is a medium in its own right, with its own laws, its own powers and limitations. The "drama" of an oral reading is like the "drama" of fiction. There is always a narrator present or implied. The events which he narrates have in a sense already occurred. Like any story teller, he recreates them in a "once upon a time" manner. The drama of a play is presented more directly, from the objective point of view, so to speak. No one stands between the actor and his audience. He participates in events that are occurring at the moment and leading toward the future. The oral interpreter's goal is a much more intimate one than the actor's. Like readers of a novel, his audience is composed of individuals, atomistic units. He is not after the mass response of a play or movie audience. He looks directly at his audience and interprets the events for each person in it. He suggests the action; he never represents it. The actor, on the contrary, seeking an immediate and mass response, uses the broad gestures and inflections that can stand without the interpretation of an intermediary. The actor and interpreter each seeks the symbols appropriate to his medium. The interpreter must translate his material into his proper symbols, not into the aborted symbols of the actor.

The point I am making is not merely that acting and oral interpretation are different arts. Most beginning oral reading textbooks make that point. What I am saying is that even those who insist on the differences between the two arts often argue from the wrong supposition. They say the two are different; but what they mean is that oral interpretation is a restricted form of acting. By perpetuating this falsehood, they leave their work wide open to attack from extremists like Mr. Winters, who, in denying the excesses of its practitioners, deny the art of oral interpretation itself.

IRVING DEER
Santa Barbara College
University of California

WHITHER REBUTTAL?

To the Editor:

Nearly all teachers of public speaking, from the acting instructor to the prolific scholar, must concern themselves with the practical courses and activities which teach students to communicate well with audiences. It well behooves us, then, to be alert for ways which provide the most significant speaking situations for our students. It would also

seem wise to be aware of any situations which might rob our speaking activities of their full effectiveness as educational devices. I believe that such a situation is developing in the use of the traditional form of debate. As this is by far the most frequently used form in classroom, audience, or tournament situations, any diminution of its effectiveness should be noted.

When I first became interested in debate, it was a common maxim that "debates are won or lost in rebuttal." Does this maxim still hold? During the last several debate seasons it has seemed to me that very little happened during the rebuttal speeches. Last year I kept a check, which obviously was subjective in nature. So far as I could determine, however, in only two debates out of seventy-five was the trend of the debate in any way altered during the rebuttal speeches. In the remaining debates, the speaking could profitably have ended with the constructive speeches.

There seemed to be two major reasons for the ineffectiveness of the rebuttal speeches. First, the trend in recent years has been to start refutation of the opposition case and defense of your own as early as possible in the constructive speeches. Certainly one cannot argue with the desirability of adapting to the opposition case, but in many debates the adapting was done to such a degree that the constructive cases suffered, and little remained for the rebuttals except what had already been stated. Many negative teams, in fact, used no constructive cases at all, but relied on the "pure negative" approach. I am not implying that this is necessarily bad; I do believe, however, that it explains in part why rebuttal sometimes becomes little more than a summary of the battle which already has been fought. As such the rebuttal is quite anticlimactic and does little more than kill twenty minutes.

Second, it appears that there are some misunderstandings of the nature of rebuttal which are making for ineffective speeches. Some of the debaters I heard were of the opinion that one could not introduce new evidence into rebuttal speeches. Needless to say, if no new evidence is introduced, little further enlightenment will result from the rebuttal speeches. Another misunderstanding which seemed prevalent was the belief that everything must be included in the rebuttal—that you cannot be selective in choosing the issues where you will attack or defend. This concept, in conjunction with the fact that often the real battles have been fought in the constructive speeches, and the belief that no new evidence is permissible, leads rebuttal further in the direction of wearisome rehashes which never further the case and sometimes are detrimental to it.

I cannot suggest a panacea for these ills. It has seemed that perhaps the cross-question type of debating overcomes some of these objections. In the cross-question debates at the Pittsburgh tournament and at Wisconsin's Delta Sigma Rho tournament, I have been impressed by the advances which are sometimes made in the cross-examination periods. The direct clash of minds which permits no evasion nor hedging seems to clear up some of the difficulties of the traditional refutation. It places the examinee on the spot, and seems to add initiative to the attack of the examiner. In addition, perhaps we aren't doing as good a job of teaching rebuttal as we used to. I feel that this has been a weakness of mine, and steps are being taken to introduce further practice sessions on rebuttal coupled with more

specific teaching of rebuttal skills into our program.

Perhaps some who coach debate or teach classes in argumentation have different views on this matter, or further suggestions. It would be interesting to hear from them. My assumption, implicit throughout this piece, is that we want to further debate and increase its stature as a healthy and effective device for training speakers.

LLOYD I. WATKINS
Ohio University

ELECTIONS 1958

The official results of the SAA elections of 1958 as reported by the Executive Secretary, follow. Persons whose names appear below will serve for full terms beginning 1 January 1959.

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

Ralph G. Nichols, University of Minnesota, St. Paul

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

LeRoy Laase, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Robert West, Brooklyn College

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Central Area:

Wallace Bacon, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas, Lawrence
D. E. Morley, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Donald Smith, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Southern Area:

Robert Capel, Stephen F. Austin Teachers College, Nacogdoches, Texas
Clarence Edney, Florida State University, Tallahassee
James Popovich, University of Georgia, Athens
Charles McGlon, Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky

Western Area:

Donald Hargis, University of California at Los Angeles
Gale Richards, University of Washington, Seattle
Rowena Roberts, High School, Colorado Springs, Colorado
William Stites, Arizona State College, Tempe

Eastern Area:

Helen Hicks, Hunter College, New York City
Gordon F. Hostettler, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Evelyn Konigsberg, Board of Education, New York City
Wilbert Pronovost, Boston University

REPRESENTATIVES-AT-LARGE IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Johnnye Akin, Denver University
Amanda Anderson, South High School, Salem, Oregon
Joseph Baccus, University of Redlands, Redlands, California
Mary Blackburn, High School, Granite City, Illinois
Earle Bradley, Denver University
Paul D. Brandes, Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg
H. P. Constans, University of Florida, Gainesville
Lionel Crocker, Denison University, Granville, Ohio
Arthur Eisenstadt, Board of Education, Newark, New Jersey
Jean Ervin, Arlington County Public Schools, Virginia
Hugo Hellman, Marquette University, Milwaukee
Orville Hitchcock, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
Robert Huber, University of Vermont, Burlington
Paul Hunsinger, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Everett Lee Hunt, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania
Father Robert A. Johnston, St. Louis University
Thomas R. Lewis, Florida State University, Tallahassee
James McBath, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
Paul Moore, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Marcella Oberle, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Cullen B. Owens, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
Victor Powell, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana

Edward A. Rogge, Tulane University, New Orleans
Robert Schacht, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Col. Warren Thompson, United States Air Force Academy, Denver
Karl R. Wallace, University of Illinois, Urbana
Claude M. Wise, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
John Wright, Fresno State College, Fresno, California
Laura Wright, Alabama College, Montevallo
W. Hayes Yeager, The Ohio State University, Columbus

EDITORSHIP OF *QJS* AND *SM* 1960-1962

To the Editor:

The undersigned committee, appointed by President Elise Hahn, will present to the Administrative Council in December 1958 the name of Douglas Ehninger as its nominee for editor of *Speech Monographs,* 1960-1962.

J. Jeffery Auer, *Chairman*
H. P. Constans
Lester Thonssen

To the Editor:

The undersigned committee, appointed by President Elise Hahn to submit a nomination for the editorship of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* for the term 1960-62, recommends Richard Murphy of the University of Illinois. The committee will present his name to the Administrative Council at the time of the SAA convention in Chicago, December 1958.

Donald C. Bryant, *Chairman*
Wilbur Samuel Howell
Bower Aly

CORRECTNESS DEFENDED

To the Editor:

May a *QJS* reader register a feeling of being just a little "hot under the collar"? To me, there is something strangely disturbing in Paul Reyes' warmhearted acceptance of the grammatically defective "There Was This Man. . . ." in the Forum of the February 1958 issue. The adjoining articles by Stanley F. Paulson and Hugo E. Hellman in that same issue perhaps point directly at the heart of the trouble—our too-ready acceptance of group conformity as our standard of excellence.

Certainly Mr. Reyes has a valid viewpoint to present. There is admittedly a positive value in our gradual escape from a pedantic and self-conscious insistence on formal grammatical excellence. Yet must we settle for habits of sub-standard grammar as the only alternative?

All of us probably have a few grammatical defects of our own, drawn from the colloquialisms of our childhood. These may sometimes enrich the individuality of our speech, giving it a color and flavor of its own. But glaringly defective structure is another matter. Our gradual acceptance of such habits seems to be based primarily on laziness, a loss of awareness of errors as they become increasingly commonplace, and more than a touch of that cussed tendency toward group conformity which is acquiring a creeping domination over the world in which we live. . . .

This is not just an academic protest. Our own 12-year-old son has recently joined the There-Was-This-Man crowd, and we are having to work hard and long to tear him away from it. Within the last few years, I have observed that even many of our public school teachers—the very persons who perhaps influence most directly our children's habits of speech—are indulging in what can only be called *sloppy* grammar. The "have wents" and double negatives are nothing more than carelessness—and when the teacher herself uses them, surely the children are going to follow her example. All too often, I suspect, the value

of getting children to participate actively in story telling is being offset by the common practice of letting them blithely begin, "There was this boy, and he went on this trip, and he saw this . . ." —and off we go, into another poorly presented story. . . .

Yes, Mr. Reyes, we do enjoy the occasional Damon Runyon "character." But if all of us are to imitate him and become "characters" of this same type, then once again the individuality of his speech is no longer individual. We have left only a new variety of group conformity, on a somewhat lower level of speech.

The interesting story teller is far more likely to make imaginative use of our language, rather than to slip into a routine and grammatically inaccurate use of undescriptive words. If we are to teach our children a love of our language, we had better help them to stretch their mental horizons instead of contracting them. Even if it takes a good deal more effort, we had better challenge them to a *meaningful* use of words, instead of smiling blandly on their inability to distinguish what-is-being-done from what-could-be-done.

DOROTHY CHILDS
Dearborn, Michigan

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT GUNDERSON, *Editor*

THE CORNELL IDIOM

Loren Reid

The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays . . . Presented to Herbert August Wichelns is the third volume of studies-in-honor to be produced by faculty, students, and friends of the Department of Speech and Drama at Cornell University. No other department of speech can make such a claim; this fact alone calls attention to *The Rhetorical Idiom* and to the two collections preceding it; and, beyond all these, to the Cornell idiom itself.

What is this new book, written partly out of affection for a fine teacher, partly out of a love of study and studies, and partly out of habit? It is seventeen articles plus an introduction, mostly on rhetorical themes. Its authors come from distinguished institutions: six from Illinois, five from Cornell, and one each from Swarthmore, Princeton, Northwestern, San Jose State, College of the City of New York, Hunter, and Washington University. Two of the authors have had essays in all three Cornell volumes and ten have contributed to two, leaving half a dozen who appear in this series for the first time.

The Cornell idiom, and by that I of course mean, loosely, the Cornell contribution to rhetoric and related fields, will be reflected upon thoughtfully by not a few who pick up the current book. The appearance of the first of the group, *Studies . . . in Honor of James Albert Winans*, in 1925 was a greater phenomenon than any one at the moment realized; the sponsors themselves limited the edition to only 400 copies, and my copy, No. 390, purchased in Iowa City in 1930, shows how slowly the stock moved. To appreciate the full extent of this phenomenon, however, try to imagine and locate a similar group of young scholars today who would undertake this kind of assignment. Only three of the authors then had Ph.D.'s; most of the group were assistant professors, like Everett Lee Hunt, M.A., assistant professor at Cornell, and Wayland Maxfield Parrish, A.M., assistant professor at Pittsburgh.

The circumstances then, of course, were dramatically urgent. Winans, the honoree, was critically ill; this fact, plus the prodding of the general editor, Drummond, a prodder of stature, plus the encouragement of the great Century publishing house, tended to hurry the young Cornellians to their L. C. Smiths. The venture had a happy culmination; even happier was the fact that Winans outlived the presentation more than thirty years. A part of this story he used to relate when he was visiting professor at Missouri: "I owe these many extra years," he would say, recalling the somewhat experimental, somewhat desperate, X-ray treatments, "to an old Dutch physicist."

Mr. Reid (Ph.D., Iowa, 1932) is Professor of Speech at the University of Missouri and Past-President of the Speech Association of America.

But these incidents account only in part for the first volume, and not at all for *Studies . . . in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond,* published, on war-time paper, in 1944; nor for the current studies. Something in the air at Cornell during the pioneer days must have lent a potent encouragement to rhetorical scholarship. In his essay introducing the Drummond volume, Hoyt H. Hudson wrote: "So he [Drummond] and Everett Hunt founded a seminar. They took a few of us through Aristotle . . . Cicero . . . and Quintilian. . . . Things began to happen. We found there were articles we wanted to write." (P. 4.)

This was in 1920-21. Hunt tells about the beginnings of the beginning, in a prefatory essay which I wish were longer, appearing in the *Idiom:*

> Winans and Drummond had come from Hamilton College, where oratory in the days of . . . President Stryker had its classical elevation and its reverence for the Grand Style. Wichelns and Caplan had been deeply influenced by Lane Cooper's teaching of poetic and rhetorical criticism and by his profound knowledge of Plato and Aristotle and their influence. (P. 2.)

The mention of Wichelns, Winans, and Harry Caplan, and of Cooper, under whom Wichelns and James Hutton came up, and under whom many studied, identifies additional influences; and, a Cornell friend writes, "one could name Carl Becker and Preserved Smith in history, J. Q. Adams in English, and probably others." I find much to speculate upon in the simple fact that thirteen of the eighteen authors of the *Idiom* took both their A.B.'s and their Ph.D.'s at Cornell, and most of these had a Cornell A.M. as well. I would find it difficult to compile a comparable list for any other graduate school; this statistic, good or bad, is a part of the Cornell idiom, and makes it thoroughgoing Cornell.

The Rhetorical Idiom has been in progress ten years. Credit for the original idea is given to H. Darkes Albright; he discussed it with the late Russell H. Wagner, and they assembled Frederick Haberman, Harold Harding, Karl Wallace, and Donald Bryant as a committee, the last-named eventually becoming editor. Cornell University Press has brought out a handsome book in a modest print order of 750, and I would guess that copies will be available in the principal university bookstores for fewer than five years.

Readers of the *Idiom* will be glad to see again Herbert A. Wichelns' "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," justly placed as the leading article. What Wichelns, then about thirty, his own Ph.D. diploma scarcely dusty on the shelf, attempted to do in 1925, before any of the graduate departments of speech had really got its Ph.D. program off the ground, was to study thirty or so books in which illustrious literary people had written about orators, and to generalize upon their standards of criticism with order, judgment, taste, and penetrating, good-natured analyses of critical misses and near-misses; and he concluded with stirring thoughts about the proper direction for rhetoric. I do not want to assert, from what I dimly recall of the middle twenties, that Wichelns was a lone voice crying in the wilderness; ideas were astir on other campuses about the function and the practice of public address. A few of these were at Grinnell, where I was being exposed to the enthusiasm of a sagacious Cornell classical spirit, J. P. Ryan; and I could collect sturdy reminiscences elsewhere, some of them undoubtedly sturdier in retrospect. Even so, however, there were plenty who conceived of style, for example, as best explained through a sort of arithmetical

accounting, and of public address itself as a non-compressible liquid to be measured in buckets; and then there was the illustrious group mentioned a few lines back. Wichelns of Ithaca turned his face another way and found words to formulate what other good minds might have been only sensing; and what he wrote has become memorable.

Bryant's "'A Peece of a Logician': The Critical Essayist as Rhetorician" could have well been placed immediately after the foregoing article. He opens in lively fashion with Sir Philip Sidney's anecdote about the teacher of horsemanship who praised horses so continually and so eloquently that if Sidney had not been a peece of a logician he would have wished himself a horse. Bryant then examines Sir Philip's rhetorical skill at defending poetry, later turning to Dryden, Addison, and others to study their lines of argument. Those who undertake formal analyses of speeches are advised to review the capable way in which Bryant manages his references to rhetorical principles, and as they scan the method they will probably find their enthusiasm stimulated for literary criticism as well.

Other relationships of rhetoric and literature are explored in the volume. James Hutton, who writes perceptively about "Rhetorical Doctrine and Some Poems of Ronsard," may be introduced to *QJS* readers as professor of classics at Cornell, and thus as one also in the Cooper tradition. What Hutton does for Ronsard is to show rhetorical influences in the works of "the prince of French poets"; these influences are shown to be inescapably significant, even though Hutton presents the evidence with restraint. Marvin T. Herrick, professor of English at Illinois, already known to *QJS* readers, writes "The Revolt in Tragicomedy Against the Grand Style," showing the development of a preference for a simpler idiom as illustrated in late sixteenth century dramatists. Students who combine a dual interest in literature and in classical rhetoric will see in the Hutton and Herrick essays suggestions for style and procedure. An application of rhetoric to still another field is Karl R. Wallace's "Rhetoric, Politics, and Education of the Ready Man," which reviews the ties between rhetoric and politics, discusses the mutual dependence of rhetoric and democracy, and finally urges students in either field to become better acquainted with both. And for some of the best writing in Wallace literature, see the final pages of his Section III (pp. 91-92).

Among studies more or less entirely concerned with rhetoric, Wilbur Samuel Howell's "Renaissance Rhetoric and Modern Rhetoric: A Study in Change" deserves a word for its scope of treatment and breadth of generalization. Cornell folk are easily at home in Renaissance and later periods—had Russell Wagner lived he would probably have contributed to the volume he helped conceive a stimulating piece on Thomas Wilson—and Howell's studies have been impressive. Here he summarizes five changes in ancient rhetoric that began to appear during the Renaissance, with here and there an application to modern rhetoric. All five deserve study, but these lines seem commanding:

> Modern democratic society would appear to offer rhetoric a greater opportunity than she has had since ancient times; for the popular audience in a democracy is the true source of authority, and the learned community has great need for the technique of learned communication. Rhetoric has grasped that opportunity, so far as her concern for the popular audience goes. . . . But rhetoric has not made much of a show in supplying a theory of learned communication. (P. 60.)

Articles also in strictly rhetorical vein are Lee S. Hultzén's "Status in Deliberative Analysis," Richard Murphy's "Preface to an Ethic of Rhetoric," L. H. Mouat's "An Approach to Rhetorical Criticism," and Wayland Maxfield Parrish's "Whately on Elocution." These will find a place on various, perhaps more specialized, reading lists. Hultzén constructs a detailed framework for status in deliberative analysis. Murphy shows practical as well as philosophical reasons for the need of a modern ethic. Mouat formulates a single set of principles (mostly non-classical?) by which to analyze rhetorical situations. Parrish, who like Hultzén has had an essay in each of the three Cornell publications, deals in this book with Whately's views on delivery, and gives the Irish archbishop a severe pummeling.

Leland M. Griffin's "The Rhetorical Structure of the Antimasonic Movement" is the sole example of a study dealing with a social issue: here the problem concerns the bitter attack upon Masons during the first quarter of the last century. The structure of "aggressor rhetoricians" and "defendant rhetoricians" is intriguing, but a principal appeal of the article is the amazing yarn itself, supported by as good sources as one could wish. In "Adolph Hitler and the Technique of Mass Brainwashing," Ross Scanlan, our best reporter of Nazi rhetoric, illustrates six principles of propaganda, the most familiar being his No. 4, "The bigger the lie, the more credible it is to the masses" (pp. 215-217). He closes with the sober reminder that the Nazis never won a majority of the German people in a free election. Arthur L. Woehl's essay on "Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Parliamentarian," summarizes the chief activities of Sheridan's parliamentary career, partly as seen through biographers like Moore and memoir writers like Wraxall. "Oliver Cromwell, Orator," by Frederick G. Marcham, an Oxford graduate who is now Cornell professor of history, portrays Cromwell as a dominant figure in an important parliamentary interlude. Marcham deftly avoids the temptation to open his article with an elaborate historical overture (this temptation bogs rhetoricians down, betimes), and focuses on Cromwell as a speaker: ideas, training for oratory, purposes, planning and preparation, effectiveness.

Three other articles should be read without too much worry over what they have to do with the rhetorical idiom. C. K. Thomas draws upon his authoritative field researches to describe, in four pages of text and a map, "The Linguistic Mason and Dixon Line." Barnard Hewitt's "A New Path for the Theatre" argues interestingly (and, to this patron, persuasively) for more adult-type drama, in arena or arena-like presentations. Frank S. Freeman, Cornell professor of psychology, writing in a style or at least with a vocabulary different from anything else in the book, impresses upon the reader, in "Significance of Verbalization in Psychological Test Responses," the importance to the clinician of the language used by those taking various psychological tests.

If I were to generalize about the Cornell idiom, and here I draw largely though not entirely upon this last work, I would say that it is more concerned today with rhetorical theory than with the criticism of speakers (and I am not overlooking the notable studies on Burke, Webster, Emerson, and others, that have appeared elsewhere); that its standards are classical, applied venturesomely and imaginatively; that it is deeply rooted in literature, including

that of the theatre, principally from Renaissance time through the eighteenth century; that it is perhaps more sensitive to literature than to history and other branches of the social studies (though exceptions can be named); that it speaks capably in foreign phrases, chiefly Latin and French, but also Greek and German, and usually assumes that translations of these terms, ynkehorne and otherwise, are superfluous for the type of gentle reader that would buy a Cornell production in the first place. It has not concerned itself much with audience studies or similar investigations; one would not look to it for wise comment about controls and variables. Miscellaneous other lines of thought, semi-rhetorical or otherwise, have not caught its fancy; one would not seek it out for an endorsement of formal semantics, nor consult it about role playing.

One should not speculate as to whether this volume will be the last shaft driven into the productive Cornell lode. Of the original group, Wichelns alone has remained at the home base of operations, as Hunt's introductory essay observes. The Cornell center of gravity is now much further west. And what the coming generation of Cornellians will write about is open to reflection; it is hardly likely that they will, or should, reduplicate the qualities of their forebears. One may, however, fairly debate whether this volume is the best of the three. It is always pleasant to hope that one's latest scholarly offspring is the handsomest, and I am inclined to believe that this is.

I will close with the usual recommendation that this book should be in the library of all interested in rhetoric. We owe thanks to Editor Bryant and his committee for getting the articles together and for overseeing the many details of publication. I can imagine that except for his editorial exhortations and generalship the original good impulses would today be as dead as Sidney's teacher's horse. And we owe many thanks to the individual authors. For just as every American has a bit of Virginia in his soul, so nearly every teacher of public speaking is at heart a classicist; and many have had their classicism strongly influenced indeed by the pervasive Cornell spirit. *The Rhetorical Idiom* will do much to extend that influence.

BOOK REVIEWED

THE RHETORICAL IDIOM: ESSAYS IN RHETORIC, ORATORY, LANGUAGE, AND DRAMA, PRESENTED TO HERBERT AUGUST WICHELNS, WITH A REPRINTING OF HIS "LITERARY CRITICISM OF ORATORY" (1925). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958; pp. viii+334. $6.00.

FRONTIER BISHOP: THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ROBERT RICHFORD ROBERTS. By Worth Marion Tippy. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958; pp. 207. $3.50.

Frontier Bishop is a romantic tale of the Old West, the story of a boy reared in the wildness of the Pennsylvania frontier, converted under the preachings of the Methodist circuit riders, "called" to be a preacher and ride the circuits himself, and, sixteen years later, elected bishop, the highest office of the youthful Methodist Episcopal Church. From somewhat meager sources (chiefly an unpublished autobiographical narrative which Roberts dictated to Matthew Simpson in 1842, and a biography hastily written by Charles Elliott and published in 1844), Dr. Tippy has written an entertaining and instructive volume.

Roberts, born in Frederick County, Maryland, in 1778, moved with his parents to the Ligonier Valley in western Pennsylvania when he was seven years of age. The early chapters of the book are largely concerned with the move west and the adventurous life on the frontier, details of which Dr. Tippy has selected from the Roberts narrative and embellished with his own knowledge of frontier customs and with descriptions of the Pennsylvania countryside. He relates also the story of Rob-

erts' conversion, his early religious conflicts over a "call" to preach, his marriage, his precarious entrance as a married man into the company of itinerant Methodist preachers, his progression from junior preacher to stationed preacher at Baltimore, Alexandria, and Philadelphia (the principal pulpits of the denomination), and to presiding elder. In 1816, when he was but thirty-eight years of age, Roberts was elected bishop; he was to serve until his death twenty-seven years later. Dr. Tippy follows Roberts' travels as an itinerant bishop, relates his difficulties in establishing a home for his family, discusses his episcopal duties. He includes some anecdotes and testimonials on Roberts' effectiveness as a preacher and devotes one chapter to preaching, largely to the themes of the period.

The volume has a brief bibliography, a very limited number of footnotes; it employs invented dialogue, rather convincingly phrased; and it gives less attention to the preaching than does Elliott—all of which indicates that Dr. Tippy has written for the general reader rather than for the scholar, but he has written well and both classes of readers will find interest in the narrative and profit from the insights.

ROBERT D. CLARK
Univesity of Oregon

PRELUDE TO INDEPENDENCE: THE NEWSPAPER WAR ON BRITAIN, 1764-1776. By Arthur M. Schlesinger. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958; pp. ix+318+xvi. $6.00.

Colonial newspapers rank with pamphlets and the pulpit as one of the most important battlefields in the war of words which preceded the American Revolution. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Emeritus Professor of History in Harvard University, provides in this volume the first detailed account of Whig and Tory efforts to utilize the colonial press as a means of influencing public opinion between 1764 and 1776. The story which emerges contains no surprises, but Professor Schlesinger's fresh viewpoint gives the reader a new and deeper understanding of some of the forces which transformed colonial discontent into resistance and, ultimately, rebellion.

Fifty pages of *Prelude to Independence* are devoted to a survey of the sources of colonial disaffection and of the channels of communication available to partisans for assuaging or intensifying this disaffection. The remainder of the book focuses on the role of newspapers in the long debate which began with the Sugar Act and culminated in the Declaration of Independence. Arguments advanced in the papers at different stages of the debate, activities of newspaper owners, both as publishers and as private citizens, and efforts by Whigs and Tories to censor the political sentiments voiced by some papers constitute Professor Schlesinger's main themes. He considers also the effect on newspapers of such contemporary events as usurpation by patriot leaders of control over the colonial postal system.

From his own study and the testimony of contemporary observers, Professor Schlesinger concludes that "although a multitude of factors from the Sugar Act onward pushed the colonists along the road to Independence, the movement could hardly have succeeded without an ever alert and dedicated press." But revolutionary agitation made its mark on the newspapers themselves as well as on public opinion. The vigorous and prolonged political dispute gave rise to a greater demand for news and views, and this, in turn, increased circulation, instilled the beginnings of the newspaper-reading habit which is still an American characteristic, and, in general, "enormously enhanced the influence of the press."

Prelude to Independence is written from the historian's viewpoint, not the rhetorician's, but students of American public address should find it a valuable book. Professor Schlesinger's survey of "the levers of propaganda" is probably more useful than the more elaborate but also more confused and confusing survey in Philip Davidson's *Propaganda and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, 1941). The bibliographical information in the footnotes (accessible via a good index) and postscript of Schlesinger's study, moreover, is a convenient and considered guide to the literature of newspaper, pamphleteer, sermonic, and other activity in this debate. A second reason for the book's importance stems from the fact that analysis of the rhetorical characteristics of a movement proceeds more expeditiously when a thorough historical account is available. *Prelude to Independence* provides the necessary background for a rhetorical study of the role played by colonial newspapers in the revolutionary debate. It extends at least an implicit invitation to students of American public address to take pen in hand.

HARRY P. KERR
Harvard University

MAGNIFICENT MISSOURIAN: THE LIFE OF THOMAS HART BENTON. By Elbert B. Smith. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1958; pp. 351. $6.00.

Some of his contemporaries, Thomas Hart Benton observed, could no more understand him than a rabbit, which litters five times a year, could understand the gestation of an elephant, which carries for eleven months. Posterity, he felt confident, would do better, especially when guided by the *Thirty Years' View*, his mammoth history of five terms in the United States Senate.

Although indispensable for the political record, the *View* is not an autobiography, and it is baffling to read in *The Saturday Review* that "because Benton wrote so much and so exposed himself to public gaze, we shall always wonder just how much he really left for a biographer to do." The answer is that he printed little about his private circumstances or his domestic joys and sorrows, left the story of his first forty years singularly skimpy, and did not reveal much about his citadel of political power in Missouri. Some critical events, such as his expulsion from the University of North Carolina, his Nashville brawl with Andrew Jackson, and his St. Louis duel with Charles Lucas, he deliberately relegated to obscurity. He left plenty indeed to be accomplished by the technical research and interpretative insight of the trained historian.

Benton's first three biographers, writing near the end of the century, contributed little to the elucidation of those areas most in need of it. Theodore Roosevelt's book is more interesting as a revelation of the author than of the subject; that by Joseph M. Rogers is negligible. William M. Meigs produced a valuable study, but its chief strength is in its exposition of the Senatorial cockpit that Benton himself had depicted most fully.

For more than fifty years after the appearance of Meigs' work in 1905 no one essayed a full length portrayal of the great Jacksonian legislator. Then, as the 1958 centennial of his death approached, two major biographies appeared in quick succession. *Old Bullion Benton*, by William N. Chambers, has been reviewed in these columns (April 1957). It now has a worthy companion, on a smaller scale, in Elbert B. Smith's *Magnificent Missourian*. Both authors are professional historians who have delved deeply, written skilfully, and maintained an admirable objectivity despite their affection and admiration for the austere Old Roman.

Chambers' book, though at least as economical in style as Smith's, is the longer by some eighty thousand words. It is therefore more comprehensive and detailed, and will unquestionably establish itself as the standard biography. Readers content with a less exhaustive account are lucky to have available *Magnificent Missourian*.

Although Professor Smith does not extensively quote, summarize, or evaluate Benton's speeches, his occasional rhetorical criticism is of much interest. He is a less thoroughgoing Jacksonian than Professor Chambers: he unites with the latter in sympathetic acceptance of Benton's belief that the people are the safest repository of power, but diverges by questioning the Bentonian confidence in the rational judgment of the electorate. Benton, he says, never fully learned that "Jacksonian democracy was created by, and in turn helped develop, an America in which the successful political leader would need more than devotion to a righteous cause and a capacity for profound reasoning." In waging his war against disunion and the extension of slavery, the essence of Benton's efforts had been "a complex and involved appeal to reason on issues loaded with emotional dynamite," and his cause had suffered from his reliance on reason and his inability or unwillingness to conciliate.

This is a tenable position. Equally tenable is the rejoinder that had Benton been a better conciliator he might have won his sixth term in the Senate but made no contribution whatsoever to his larger aim, the preservation of the Union. Right or wrong on matters like these, possession of a point of view adds greatly to the value and interest of Professor Smith's biography.

Norman W. Mattis
University of North Carolina

WHAT ROOSEVELT THOUGHT: THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL IDEAS OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT. By Thomas H. Greer. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1958; pp. xvi+244. $5.00.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT AND THE NEW DEAL. By Frank Freidel. London: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. 19. $.40.

The outpouring of studies on Franklin D. Roosevelt continues at a rapid rate, rivalling in number those on Lincoln. Although neither of the items considered in this review can be considered a major contribution to Rooseveltiana, each does well what it purports to do.

In the first, Thomas H. Greer, professor in the Department of Humanities of Michigan State University, explains that his objective is to "find and set forth precisely what Roosevelt thought on vital social and political questions." Instead of considering "particular measures," he declares his interest in the "thinking which underlay them." He centers his discussion in the following topics: underlying social views, the state, economic life, the American Constitutional system, the presidency, politics, basic freedoms, the good neighbor policy, and "strategy for survival." For sources he draws upon letters, speeches, press conferences, and the writings of Roosevelt as well as upon the writings of other New Dealers and close associates. Skillfully blending exposition with numerous quotations, he has produced an interesting and readable book.

The second is a pamphlet which contains an "inaugural lecture" which Freidel delivered before the University of Oxford on May 1, 1956. In a terse development he interprets for his English listeners contributory influences in Roosevelt's early life and the significant developments of the New Deal. Much of what he said will seem commonplace to many Americans, but perhaps it was appropriate for Englishmen not so familiar with the decade of the thirties in the United States.

Was Roosevelt conservative or radical? Both men give answers to this question. They agree that neither label fits the man. Freidel characterizes the Roosevelt method as "the trial-and-error pragmatic approach." He thinks that in the early years Roosevelt "was fundamentally conservative, ready to accept cautious counsel and limited programmes until they had proven themselves economically and politically unworkable. When they failed, he was quick to discard them in favor of new and more daring experiments." In essential agreement, Greer argues that Roosevelt was not a radical but "an innovator" who "sought practical means of solving the problems which faced America in the thirties." He concludes that "the general term which best fits Roosevelt is that of 'moderate reformer.'"

WALDO W. BRADEN
Louisiana State University

AL SMITH AND HIS AMERICA. By Oscar Handlin. Boston: Little, Brown, 1958; pp. xii+207. $3.50.

In this short, compact biography of Al Smith, the editor of the Library of American Biography turns author and presents a clear and interesting addition to the series of biographies of famous Americans. The study lacks detail because it is brief, but it is well-written and deserves to be read by students of history, politics, and speech.

Students of public address will find that the author is aware of Smith's speaking ability as a factor in his success as a Tammany politician, a legislator, and an outstanding New York governor. He says, "The written word did not come as easily to Al Smith as the spoken word. Never a great reader of books, he was always more at ease before an audience than before blank paper." Such references to Smith's speaking may not constitute rhetorical criticism, but they are numerous and they help to convey a more complete picture of Al Smith. The positions Smith took on various public issues and the reasons for his stand are often well explained. Smith's basic honesty, his understanding of practical politics in New York, his optimism, and his vision of America are made unusually clear.

The most thought-provoking aspect of this biography is the author's concept of the immigrant's vision of America as the land of equal opportunity for all. Smith, the son of an immigrant, succeeded in American life through his own ability, only to be halted when he reached for the greatest prize, the Presidency. An artificial barrier, religious prejudice, kept the vision from being true. The defeats of 1928 and 1932 were tragedies for Smith and for all Americans. Have Americans learned a lesson from the campaign of 1928? Handlin believes that as late as 1944, the year of Smith's death, neither a Catholic nor a Jew could be elected President. Does the barrier still exist? It is this unanswered question that gives added significance to the story of Al Smith's life.

HOLLIS L. WHITE
Queens College

LAW FOR THE PUBLIC SPEAKER: LEGAL ASPECTS OF PUBLIC ADDRESS. By George P. Rice, Jr. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1958; pp. 189. $2.75.

This modest-sized work is written with the non-lawyer in mind; it is not a legal treatise, though it is a refresher of Constitutional law for the lawyer in the areas of speech, assembly, and the Fifth Amendment, areas with which the public expects him to be familiar. Mr. Rice has approached his material in a manner reflecting the lawyer's careful selection of authority while avoiding the latter's tendency toward excessive citation. For reading ease, ci-

tations are placed at the end of each chapter. The outline-like technique used makes for precise and lucid presentation within each chapter.

Mr. Rice sets for himself the purpose of introducing the public speaker to the legal areas that affect speaker and speech, so that there may be "better public speaking, better listening, and better citizenship." He discusses the landmark Supreme Court cases concerning speech and assembly in "The Supreme Court on Free Speech." Two chapters more fully consider the conflict between the Constitutional right of free speech and states' regulatory powers. "Lawful Use of Loud-Speaking Devices" balances the speaker's attempt to reach as large an audience as possible with the individual's right to quiet enjoyment and privacy. "The Hostile Audience" raises two problems: one, the question of whether to restrain the speaker or audience when a breach of the peace appears imminent; and two, when to determine and who shall determine that a "clear and present danger" exists.

Mr. Rice moves away from Constitutional law in the chapter "Defamation By Slander." Here are considered the characteristics of slanderous speech, as distinguished from criticism, and the extent of liability. "Property Rights In Public Address" recognizes that speech is a tool for making a living and considers copyright, unfair competition, tax, and probate laws as they affect the speaker's economic interests.

Like most scissors-and-paste books, and this is one, this writing lacks continuity and includes several chapters which, although interesting, are irrelevant as measured by the title. "The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination" deals with the Fifth Amendment and immunity statutes. Inclusion of this chapter must have stemmed from the interest in Congressional and academic investigations. Another chapter touches on the relatively new field of free communication under international law. "Trial By Jury in Ancient Athens" and "The Classics and the Bible In English Eloquence" serve as background to the last chapter, "The Teacher and Political Morality," which is a vehicle for Mr. Rice's central concern: the desertion by our citizenry of political and economic theories of individual self-reliance. This chapter is difficult to read because of the ambiguous use of the phrase "political morality." Mr. Rice begins by using the generally accepted definition of political morality as the judgments to be placed upon the motivation and conduct of officeholders. He then shifts his meaning to adherence to our original political and economic theories of self-reliance. Mr. Rice hopes that the speech teacher will reinstill in students this philosophy.

Much of the material in this book could have been reworked and tied together to support this thesis and thus have been a challenging contribution. But as it is the book is disconnected, touching upon several interesting, worthwhile topics, without doing a thorough job on any.

D. Tyner Brown
St. Louis, Missouri

HUMAN MOTIVATION: PROBABILITY AND MEANING. By Fred T. Schreier. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957; pp xxii+256. $5.00.

Traditional rhetoric is acquiring some strange hand-maidens in the task of explaining how human behavior may be affected by oral discourse. There is a notable convergence upon this problem by (to mention only a few examples) philosophers—such as Suzanne Langer, in her *Philosophy in a New Key;* anthropologists—such as Edward Sapir, in *Culture, Language, and Personality;* linguists—such as Joshua Whatmough, in his *Language: A Modern Synthesis;* social psychologists—in Herbert Mead's *Mind, Self, and Society* and its "updating" by Walter Coutu in *Emergent Human Nature;* semioticians—such as Charles Morris, in his *Signs, Language, and Behavior;* sociologists—such as Floyd Allport, in his *Institutional Behavior;* publicists—such as Walter Lippmann, in his now-classic *Public Opinion;* psychoanalysts—such as Dominic A. Barbara, in his *Your Speech Reveals Your Personality* (not to ignore Sigmund Freud's magnificent *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious*); neo-rhetoricians—in Kenneth Burke's *A Grammar of Motives;* and psychologists, of a range so vast that we may select for mention Calvin S. Hall and Gardner Lindzey's compendium, *Theories of Personality,* summarizing thirteen divergent approaches.

Since each discipline uses a different language (as do many individual practitioners within each discipline, the first task is one of translation—always troublesome and often fraught with dangers of misunderstanding. Different terms refer to what appear to be the same concept; and, more disturbing, similar terms are used for quite dissimilar referents. Hours of laborious interpretation frequently dredge up

no more than old, familiar notions that have been decked out in esoteric terminologies.

Nevertheless, it does not suffice to barricade ourselves off from the researches and conceptualizing of our academic compatriots by insisting that, after all, "it is all in Aristotle." From Miller's *Language and Communication*, through Maslow's *Motivation and Personality*, to B. F. Skinner's new *Verbal Behavior*, the evidence accumulates that speech is proving an irresistibly attractive field to many types of our fellow academicians. Unless we welcome their work and undertake the responsibility for synthesizing their findings, we shall awake to discover that we have been stranded out on the fringes of our own chosen specialty.

Schreier's *Human Motivation* well repays the study that it demands (though this reviewer must confess to an inability to assess its 100 pages of statistical methodology). Schreier defines motivation in causative terms—feeling that much which has been written on the subject is merely descriptive, not explanatory. "However, a single case has been fully explained only if these two statements can be made: The event would not have occurred if the condition had been lacking; and it was bound to occur with the condition given."

So far as motivation is concerned, he says, "we have not discovered any such perfect and universal psychological laws; what we have discovered are only frequency distributions." But it does not help us much with a specific case if we can only know that "normally such-and-such behavior might occur." His conclusion is: "let us abandon the hope of finding universal laws of motivation."

In his effort to reduce motivational research to a science, he narrows the field of inquiry by eliminating all "external factors," Koffka, Lewin, and Coutu (to name but a few "environmentalists") notwithstanding. He also questions that actions need not arise from need, or that they have any essential connection with reward and punishment. In a very cogent passage on habits, he reminds us that what initiates a pattern of behavior may be very different from the influences which result in its continuance. He points out that it is relatively useless to list various motivational factors unless we are prepared in the specific instance being studied to assign proper weight to each.

In a fine concluding chapter on attitudes, he points out that an attitude is a generalized readiness to act, so that, in any given situation, an attitude can be brought to bear only through syllogistic reasoning, which (Aristotle to the contrary) he holds to be our normal mode of thinking. Most studies of attitude and prejudice he finds inadequate in that they deal with only one or some of the causative factors, not with their true multiplicity. Finally, he concludes that we all hold such an intricate maze of interlocked attitudes that not one but several (or many) are brought to bear simultaneously, with a complexity that defies analysis.

As a criticism of the field of motivational studies, this book is highly valuable. As a guide to the conduct of such studies, it is apparent that Schreier's methodological approach leaves much to be desired. When he warns us to avoid inclusiveness while also reminding us of the "vast network of interlocking factors," it is difficult to determine how he would have us take hold of the problem. As for his own work, he is a "market analyst," where, happily, "mass motivations" (or generalized tendencies) are of more interest than single cases.

Perhaps this is where the rhetorician must rest, at least for the time being: that it is easier to devise methods that will "motivate" sixty per cent of the members of an audience than it is to devise techniques of securing even sixty per cent change-in-the-desired-direction by one auditor.

ROBERT T. OLIVER
The Pennsylvania State University

THE DYNAMICS OF PLANNED CHANGE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES. By Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson, Bruce Westley. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1958; pp. viii+312. $4.50.

LEADER ATTITUDES AND GROUP EFFECTIVENESS. By Fred E. Fiedler. Final Report Office of Navy Research Project NR 170-106, N6-ori-07135. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1958; pp. iii+69. $1.75.

SOCIAL PROCESS IN THE COMMUNITY AND THE GROUP. By Grace L. Coyle and Margaret E. Hartford. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1958; pp. v+89. $1.00.

In an unstable, complex, and rather dangerous world nothing is more certain than that enterprises must be ready and able to make changes within themselves—and this at an accelerating rate. Obsolescence comes faster and faster in this era and those who do not plan how they are to deal with outside forces,

those who permit obsolescence in their thinking and actions find themselves in for rude shocks.

For the initiating and carrying through of planned change the Lippitt book brings out the experience of a large number of consultants, personnel directors, psychological clinicians, and personnel specialists. Their practices on the firing-line in industrial, educational, and health agencies have been researched and described.

The importance of definition and clarification of goals and relationships, the stimulating of aspiration for change, the heightening and spreading of sensitivity to specific problems, the creation of special social atmospheres, and the influence of recalcitrant sub-groups and individuals which hold back the larger enterprise are pointed out. No magical keys are given for the change agent to use. Yet he will probably be less frustrated when he is made to expect reluctance to admit weaknesses by the client system, fear of failure or awkwardness in trying to initiate a new practice or behavior pattern, a fatalistic expectation of failure instilled by previous unsuccessful attempts to change, and a fear of losing some current satisfaction (for example, power or dependency). How gradual, or how fast, or how to complete the change desired, are all delicate matters of evaluation, timing, in the involvement of the whole enterprise.

The monograph by Fiedler summarizes a six-year research project supported by the Group Psychology Branch in the Office of Naval Research carried out at the University of Illinois. The aim of the research was to ascertain the variables in social perception that were important to group effectiveness and performance. Data which led to the locating of several such variables were obtained by a variety of tests and statistical procedures applied to the formal and informal leaders by studies of championship basketball teams, survey parties, army tank crews, bomber crews, the foremen of open hearth steel shops, and the administrators of consumer cooperatives. The results obtained agreed consistently in unraveling part of the complex interactions which concern many leadership problems.

The results indicated that the more effective team had a leader who was more distant and who could and would reject those whom he considered to be potentially poor co-workers; he tended to judge the personality of others in light of their ability to do their job. This was in marked contrast to the leader who was more of a buddy to members of his group, who had relatively greater closeness, acceptance, and warmth even with those with whom he could not work, and who was less willing to reject a person because he could not perform in a team situation. For instance, the leader of a winning basketball team as much as tells his teammates that they should either shape up or get off the team; the leader of a poor team is more likely to say, "Gee its too bad you weren't in good form today. But don't worry about it. We all have our off days and none of us played too well this time." The less effective leader tended to be significantly influenced by his "partner" key-man of his group —a subordinate whose work was vital to whole group effectiveness, such as the navigator of a bomber crew. The less effective leader tends visibly to be concerned about his interpersonal relations, and he feels the need for the approval and the support of his associates.

Coyle and Hartford summarize data and practice concerning social practices, particularly in respect to the curriculum for training professional social workers. The materials of this monograph are designed as a guide to social work educators interested in the construction and content of courses on social, group, and cultural process. In this context may be seen the intergroup communication map with the stratifications and barriers to family and community development. Other factors which affect both communication and change are the colorcast structures, the ethnic structures, the subcultures of adolescents, adults, and older people; the occupational structure, income levels, and standards of living.

In any community there are many pyramids of power, all existing within the larger pyramid of the total community. "There are pyramids in each business and in all business, in each industry and in all industry, in labor, in civic associations, churches, political groups, social clubs, ethnic groups. Each pyramid has various levels of power within it, and there is interaction between the various levels on particular projects of community action." Various groups are located at different levels in a larger pyramid of the total community and their influence varies from situation to situation.

ELWOOD MURRAY
University of Denver

PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF COMMUNICATION. Edited by Paul H. Hock and Joseph Zubin. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1958; pp. xii+305. $6.75.

What is the "psychopathology" of communication? The term could mean that kind of communication that leads to severe maladjustment. Or the term might mean that kind of communication which does not seem to move toward the goals desired by those communicating—in which there is a kind of "breakdown" and the communication may be even a hindrance. Either meaning might be provocative and useful. Some of the chapters of this book provide stimulation in these directions.

Reuch's concept of the "tangential response" as one of the causes of breakdown in communication is a case in point. This kind of response may be illustrated by the author's story: When little Johnny, aged five, runs into the house and says, "Look, I found a snail," and mother answers, "Go wash your muddy hands," we have a tangential response. The mother's response was caused by the child's exclamation; she did not ignore the comment by replying: "It's time for dinner." But the response did not show the degree of mutual understanding and proper sympathy that might have been evoked. Tangential responses may severely limit mutual understanding and mutual influence in discussions, and the concept might, therefore, be a key to some kinds of breakdown in discussions.

Carroll's stimulating article on the psychological effects of language structure might well be read by rhetoricians. He proposes a theory to explain how language changes our perceptions. We have long suspected that our Indo-European grammar has something to do with the way we think about and perceive things. The hypothesis most frequently used to explain the effect of language, used by Sapir and Whorf, is what may be called the "mold theory," which states that our perceptions are possible only within the "molds" provided for by language. Carroll, however, insists that language furnishes a kind of "lattice" through which we see the world somewhat vaguely. What the effects of the syntax and grammar of our symbols are, however, remains an important area of rhetoric in which few rhetoricians seem to have been much interested.

In addition, the technique of content analysis of Hambridge and Gottshalk may provide a new means for the analysis of breakdowns in discussion and for comprehending the effect of public address. In addition, the technique may provide a means of studying the ethos of a speaker since the authors report that "word choice and frequency" of certain word categories are "related to the dynamic state of the patient." So close is the relationship that the authors believe that one can perform, occasionally, differential diagnosis using the kind of content analysis presented here.

The meaning of the "psychopathology" of communication in this book is, perhaps deliberately, vague. In general, the term seems to mean "any possible relation between abnormal behavior and communication." One chapter reports a study of the communication of psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers at regular clinical conferences of a large hospital; it is reported—as if it were news—that the "higher" ranking persons talk the most and the "lower" ranking least. One study indicates that delayed auditory feedback causes a more pronounced effect on schizophrenics than on normal children, at least sometimes. Another article, with no reference to communication, points out interesting parallels in the development of the science of pathology and the "science" of psychopathology. Another chapter points out that often behavior in the waiting room may be an index of a patient's mental state. In all, there are seventeen articles of uneven quality. Occasionally a critique is offered, but most papers are without benefit of this salutary device and the critiques are not particularly critical. This work is a collection of papers from the forty-sixth annual convention of the American Pathological Association, an organization with about 170 members. On the whole, it is about what might be expected when the papers of a convention are published.

OTIS M. WALTER
University of Pittsburgh

THE PRINCIPLES OF SEMANTICS. By Stephen Ullmann. Second Edition. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957; pp. 346. $10.00

MODERN LINGUISTICS. By Simeon Potter. Fair Lawn, New Jersey: Essential Books 1958; pp. 192. $3.25.

Modern linguistics, according to Stephen Ullmann, is tending to become a kind of pseudo-mathematics devoid of any humanistic content, a lop-sided discipline concerned almost solely with the formal aspect of language, and so may well become incommensurate with its own subject matter. Modern linguistics prides itself on a kind of "scientific rigour" which is applied much more readily to problems of phonology and morphology than to those of semantics and syntax. In its avoidance of semantics, modern (structural) linguistics is a

disappointment "to philosophers and others who are deeply interested in language and are looking to the linguist for enlightenment." But the real trouble is not that modern linguists "are avoiding semantic criteria in their phonological and morphological studies, but that they seldom venture beyond phonology and morphology." This negative attitude can be traced back to the teaching of Leonard Bloomfield.

Bloomfield's tendency to avoid questions of meaning was more apparent than real, however. On more than one occasion, he indicated that only lack of time had prevented him from considering the highly important and pertinent question of meaning in language and linguistics as thoroughly as he would have liked to have done. Meanwhile, European scholars have steadily persisted in semantic research. Ferdinand de Saussure, Ogden and Richards, Gustaf Stern, Leo Weisgerber, and Jost Trier, among others, have all introduced significant approaches to linguistic semantics while their American counterparts have neglected its serious study.

Ullmann's *Principles of Semantics* presents a most comprehensive introduction to modern thought on the subject. The text of the original edition has been left unaltered except for the addition of a supplement on recent developments and the expansion of the bibliography to include material published in several languages since 1951. Since there is little we would add to Heinz Werner's full-length review of the first edition in *Language* (XXVIII [1952], 249-256), we shall restrict our comment to the new material in the present edition. It should be noted, however, that the chapter on General Semantics has nothing to do with Korzybski's "system." Despite a note of apology, the title remains inexplicably and unnecessarily confusing.

Ullman's view of language bears a distinctive neo-Humboldtian orientation. It can be noted in his discussion of a *Weltbild*, of a linguistic *Zwischenwelt*, and of linguistic field theory which "remains one of the most fruitful experiments in modern semantics, and after a quarter of a century, it has lost none of its momentum." Such a view permits a synthesis of such diverse approaches as those of Saussure, Wittgenstein, the amazingly similar Trier-Weisgerber and Sapir-Whorf hypotheses, the Ogden and Richards scheme, as well as many other modern approaches to the study of meaning, even including Korzybski's. Ullmann's comprehensive statement offers sound refutation to the charge that "any language system has a structural side and a semantic side" for, as is shown, many applications of structural semantics can be made to structural phonology and morphology as well as vice versa. Ullmann's *Principles of Semantics* may not be definitive, but it is certainly the most thorough presentation of the subject this reviewer has ever seen.

Modern linguistics, according to Simeon Potter, comprehends, in the "accepted opinion," phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. After stating "the main facts" relating to each of these recognized branches of linguistics in a chapter apiece, he sets one aside in which he has "ventured to offer more personal views on the omnipresence in utterance, and segments of utterances, of the form-meaning complementary relationship (like two sides of a coin)." Potter's discussion of the entire field of linguistics, however, pretends to be neither as broad nor as deep as Ullmann's treatment of the branch of semantics alone.

Those who know his paperback entitled *Our Language* will find Potter's *Modern Linguistics* a source of equal delight. There seems to emanate from the writings of "the English philologians" on the subjects of language, languages, and linguistics an aura of graciousness, ease, and tolerance that is noticeably lacking, by comparison, in similar writings by Americans. There is no earnest, special pleading in the writings of the "anglologians," almost indicative of their commonwealth acceptance of "peoples speaking languages" as contrasted with our American sense of guilt of a linguistic ethnocentrism that cries the parochial view of (at best) "my-dialect-is-different-from-your-dialect," if not (at worst) "my-dialect-is-better-than-your-dialect."

Anyone interested in speech, language, and communication, whether pro, tyro, or dilettante, can benefit from, and enjoy, Potter's *Modern Linguistics*.

JOHN B. NEWMAN
Queens College

THE USES OF ARGUMENT. By Stephen Edelston Toulmin. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1958; pp. viii+264. $4.50.

This is a radical and welcome book—radical in that it dares to call to account, and quite candidly, too, positions which many philosophers and logicians have considered hallowed ground—welcome (at least to those of us in argumentation and debate) in that it shows a way for logic to meet its responsibilities to everyday argument.

For many years students of argument have been disturbed by the tendency of traditional logic to become increasingly mathematical and symbolic—a formal science of "episteme." This trend is understandable but regrettable to those who are concerned with the theoretical and practical considerations of everyday argument in various fields of endeavor. Writing especially for philosophers and logicians, Professor Toulmin argues that logic should be a comparative rather than a purely formal, analytic study. He contends that the procedures of the formal syllogism (all A's are B's, etc.) are quite inadequate to describe argument as it actually and rightfully appears in various fields, and rejects as confused the traditional concept of deductive inference.

In the brilliant essays in the development and support of his thesis, philosopher Toulmin discusses in detail: (1) the fields of argument and modals, (2) probability, (3) the layout of arguments, (4) working logic and idealized logic, and (5) the origins of epistemological theory.

In these essays is found the most thorough examination of the anatomy of argument that I have read in recent years. This technical examination is made with unusual clarity and intelligibility. At times the style may seem a bit tedious—too much for too little—yet as one continues into the essays the abundant examples, the witticisms, and the unusually able analysis make one eager to get on with it. And when the reader comes to the close he finds that he has had new ground broken for him, that new and stimulating questions are tugging at him, and he closes the book with an "almost thou persuadest me."

Undoubtedly a number of Professor Toulmin's colleagues in philosophy and logic will recoil at reading some of the essays of this book, but to many working in the field of everyday argument he has called traditional logic to a higher and more useful ground, and has pioneered in new concepts which could at least begin to bring the logician and the practitioner in argument into a more fruitful working relationship.

WINSTON L. BREMBECK
University of Wisconsin

INTERNATIONAL PROPAGANDA: ITS LEGAL AND DIPLOMATIC CONTROL. By L. John Martin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958; pp. viii+284. $5.75.

In December 1943, the Foreign Broadcasting Intelligence Division of the FCC reported that more than 360 powerful radio transmitters located in almost sixty different political units, including Allied, Axis, and neutral nations, were carrying on psychological warfare. The volume of international propaganda which flooded the airways consisted of well over two and a half million words every twenty-four hours.

International propaganda did not stop with the cessation of hostilities. Its utility having been demonstrated during the war, the major powers, including the United States, Great Britain, and the USSR, projected plans for its continued use in peace time. Mr. Martin gives an excellent account of the expansion of international propaganda activities carried on by these countries during the past decade and provides a detailed, statistical analysis and description of their current dimensions throughout the world.

In the early chapters of the book, the author discusses briefly the historical background of propaganda, and deals with its meaning and scope from both the social science and legal points of view.

The chapters which follow contain the more important part of the text. These deal with the attempts of nations to control the flow of propaganda across national boundaries and to protect themselves from its undesirable effects. General and particular treaties limiting international propaganda are reviewed in Chapter V. This is followed by a comprehensive analysis of controls exercised by individual states under municipal law as well as those of an extra-territorial character. Chapter VIII contains an informative discussion on the use of diplomacy to control international propaganda, including formal protests, diplomatic restrictions, and non-recognition.

Finally, Mr. Martin speculates on the future with respect to these controls. He concludes that "because of changing ideologies, even within a state, the subtleties of modern propaganda, and the difficulty of definition, it is inconceivable that international law will ever control propaganda, no matter what its content, so long as the sovereignty of states is recognized. The control of propaganda will remain in the municipal laws of states and the bargaining power of diplomacy."

Many books have been written on the subject of propaganda. The chief value of Mr. Martin's work, however, is that it brings together in readily readable form a wealth of information on the current status of propaganda at the international level and the variety of at-

tempts by nations to control its use for desirable and undesirable purposes.

It should be mentioned that this is a thoroughly scholarly study. In fact, the documentation contains more than forty pages of footnotes. It is impressive research which deserves high commendation.

WALTER B. EMERY
Michigan State University

TV AND OUR SCHOOL CRISIS. By Charles A. Siepmann. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1958; pp. 198. $3.50.

To a proponent of his ideas, Professor Siepmann's book seems to be a rare combination of warm advocacy and cool objectivity. In specifying how television can ameliorate current shortages of teachers and classrooms he is as scrupulous in listing explicitly the subjects which cannot be taught by television as he is enthusiastic in reporting those instances in which television demonstrably improves instruction. He is equally careful to indicate those subjects in which learning by television is "no worse than" learning in the traditional classroom.

It is difficult to assess the persuasiveness of *TV and Our School Crisis* for the reader who dreads television as the harbinger of automation in education. Although Professor Siepmann has an ingratiating style, he has obviously written in haste, and internal evidence suggests that neither author nor editor read the first draft critically enough, for the printed text includes several obvious slips of the pen. (The worst of these is the misuse of "bedizened" on page 36.) These lapses by no means vitiate the soundness of Professor Siepmann's exposition and argument, but opponents of his ideas might well cite them as presumptive evidence that his book contains comparable errors of fact or judgment.

Adherents to Professor Siepmann's views will probably find no more than two adverse criticisms of his book. The first is that his argument that we will somewhere find sufficient funds for educational television in the same way that parents somehow manage to provide medical care for an ailing child seems to be an analogy more sentimental than convincing. Second, in his listing of the obstacles to the optimum use of educational television Professor Siepmann makes no mention of the group whose opposition (in my opinion) will be the most difficult to overcome: those teachers who are bitterly fighting television in the school because (quite unconsciously, I am sure) they dread the resultant exposure of their ineptitude.

HENRY L. MUELLER
University of Illinois

MASS COMMUNICATIONS: A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS. By Richard E. Chapin. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957; pp. viii+148. $5.75.

This book is a compilation, evaluation, and interpretation of all available statistics concerning the mass media industry (newspapers, magazines, books, radio, television, and motion pictures). While some of the information presented in this volume has been available in various bulletins, pamphlets, and magazines, some is new; and in addition, the aggregate body of data constitutes, in nearly every instance, virtually new units of information.

Each of the media is examined statistically in terms of ten questions: How many consumers are there? How much is each medium used? What is the cost to the consumer? How many producers are there? What are the revenues for each medium? How many people does the industry employ, and how much does it pay them? What are the industry's expenses? What is the total income for each medium? What is the rate of return? How much competition is there? Each series is evaluated in terms of reliability, validity, and comparability. In addition, each series is analyzed and interpreted with respect to its historical continuity and to trends which become evident.

As for the utility of this book for workers in speech, it is clearly a reference work—and a reference work pertaining to the mass media. As such, it would appear to be of greatest interest and value to those in the areas of radio and television. Perhaps this is true—and it appears that the work should have very significant usefulness to such persons—but it should also have significance for many workers in the area of rhetoric and public address, in that this is necessarily closely related to several of the mass media in either a supplementary or a contrasting sense.

As for the caliber of this book, it is an outstanding example of painstaking and thorough searching for sources and of careful arraying of data. It is much more, however. It is not only a thorough and a scholarly evaluation of sources of the data (most important as a general practice and also because of the many discrepancies in data) but also an equally com-

petent interpretation of the statistical findings.

This book is an example of excellent craftsmanship in printing, binding, and format.

KENNETH G. HANCE
Michigan State University

THE THEATRE IN SOVIET RUSSIA. By Nikolai A. Gorchakov, translated by Edgar Lehrman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957; xvi+480. $10.00.

Gorchakov, a worker in the Russian theatre from 1918 to 1940, has filled an important lack in our apparatus for understanding the modern theatre by preparing and publishing his *The Theatre in Soviet Russia*. We have available in English a considerable number of accounts of the Russian theatre by observers and enthusiasts but, until Gorchakov's work was translated into English by Edgar Lerhman and published by the Columbia University Press, we had no authentic account.

After an interesting "Introduction," he devotes a first chapter to an explanation of the nineteenth-century Russian theatre and to the conditions prevailing in that theatre. Against this background, he details the rise and development of the Moscow Art Theatre from 1898 to October of 1917. In this account he sets forth one of the best summaries available of the theories and techniques of Stanislavsky. A third chapter of this Part One is devoted to "The Great Innovators of the Pre-revolutionary Theatre."

Part Two, consisting of four chapters, is concerned with the first decade of the Soviet theatre from 1917 to 1927, a decade of surprising and magnificent accomplishments. The Bolshevik revolution released a flood of theatrical activity throughout Russia that was of such proportions as to be almost unaccountable and unbelievable. Theatres, amateur and professional, sprang up everywhere—in the cities, in the country, in the factories, in the Red Army and Red Navy, in the schools and universities. One of the first Soviet experimental theatres was the Hermitage Theatre established by Vsevolod Meyerhold in Petrograd, which opened on 12 July 1919, with a production of Molière's *A Doctor in Spite of Himself*. The communists had already recognized the importance of the theatre and set up in January of 1918, two months after they seized power, the Theatre Section of the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment. Lenin signed a decree on 26 August 1919, entitled "On the Unification of Theatre Work," which nationalized the property of all theatres throughout Russia. He likewise set up the Central Theatre Committee, which was responsible for subordinating theatre to Bolshevik ideology. The communists early understood that the theatre was a potent weapon for influencing the masses. Nationalization was not enough. Theatres must eventually be controlled completely for communist ends, but this control could not be applied immediately because all of the theatre's artists, with very few exceptions, were non-communists and because in the early days the resistance movement against the usurping regime was a brake that prevented that regime from going too far too fast. About the only communists in the theatre before the Revolution were the stage hands and the costume people. The actors, directors, and designers belonged to the "bourgeois intelligensia." The Bolsheviks had to use these and to do so had to compromise with them; hence the feigned liberality of the early Bolshevik theatre. Moreover, there were many different views among the communists during the first decade as to what course the Soviet theatre should follow. There was not the slightest question, however, about the people's wanting theatre. They flocked to them night after night, packing and jamming them even when they were cold, dirty, uncomfortable. Masses upon masses of humanity that had never or seldom been to the theatre before now poured into them.

In this Part Two of his book, Gorchakov emphasizes over and over that this brilliant flourishing of theatre in the Soviet Union between 1917 and 1927 was the result of the flowering of theatre artists, theatre programs, and theatre experiments already evolved in Russia before communism came to power. This Part culminates in a chapter on the heyday of Soviet theatre that reveals by its analysis of several of the greatest theatres and theatre figures just how brilliant this flowering was. The first of these great innovators was Vsevlod Meyerhold whose significant experimental work began with his brilliant production on 15 April 1922 of Crommelynck's *Le Cocu magnifique*. The author analyzes this and other productions of this renowned director, probably the most illustrious that Russia produced. He says without reservation that "the greatest masterpiece in the entire history of Russian directing" was Meyerhold's production of Gogol's *The Inspector General*. Meyerhold believed that the art of theatre was the supreme art and that a drama was a mere script, not to be faithfully interpreted by the director, but to be used by him as the basis and beginning of theatric creation.

Another most important contributor to the heyday of Soviet theatre was Alexander Tairov's Kamerny Theatre. Its influence in Western Europe exceeded that of Meyerhold's theatre. Tairov rejected naturalism even more completely than did Meyerhold. He likewise rejected completely the theories of Stanislavsky and the Moscow Art Theatre. Melody and rhythm were the dominant factors in a Kamerny production. What the audience saw in this theatre was something similar to a classical ballet placed at the service of rendering a drama. With his production of O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape* in 1926 Tairov began a period of approach towards or compromise with realism. In that same year he staged O'Neill's *Desire Under The Elms* in a production that was free of the propaganda that marked *The Hairy Ape*. His production of *All God's Chillun Got Wings* in 1929 continued his "Western Themes," for which he was to be condemned.

A third great theatre and producer was The Vaktangov Theatre under Eugene Vaktangov, who died of cancer as a young man in 1922. Vaktangov began his career as a passionate disciple of Stanislavsky. Eventually he evolved an art of production that combined that of Stanislavsky and that of Meyerhold. Vaktangov and Stanislavsky were the only great directors to found schools.

Prior to his analysis of Vaktangov's theatre, Gorchakov traces the developments of the First and Second Moscow Art Theatres and of the various Studios of the Moscow Art Theatre. He brings this section of his study to a conclusion with two paragraphs of summary from which I quote the following sentences:

> During its first decade, the Soviet theatre presented a dazzling surface picture. To those viewing it casually or from a distance, its brilliance and lustre seemed unparalleled. Apparently those in power were exhibiting sublime intelligence in assimilating the best of the old theatre and sponsoring its extension. The sheer physical development of the stage under Soviet rule—the mushrooming of theatres in the cities, the same rapid expansion in the provinces, the countless amateur groups attached to farms and factories—all seemed proof that the Golden Age was at hand.

Alas, such was not the case, as he shows in Part Three of his book on the second decade of the Soviet theatre. He indicates quite clearly and amply that the Bolshevik dictators did not care for the brilliant theatre experiments and experimenters and were merely biding their time. That time came in 1927 when the Bolsheviks launched a ruthless civil war "to liquidate the class enemies in the countryside." The whole plan of the civil war in the theatre was discussed at length and measures were adopted for suppressing all forms of freedom. These were embodied in resolutions adopted by the Theatre Conference of 1927. Their major means, but by no means their only instrument of suppression and control, was and is censorship. The frightening realities of Soviet censorship as he explores and explains them remind one vividly of the instruments employed by the Inquisition and make one wonder to what extent the communists directly borrowed from the Jesuits. In any event, the instruments employed between 1927 and 1937 were quite sufficient to subordinate the theatre completely to the Communist Party.

Part Four, the last section of the book, is devoted to showing the dismal results of this subordination. One by one the old artists were silenced, driven out of the theatre, or liquidated. A gray pall of uniformity and complete standardization came to mark the Soviet theatre and drama between 1937 and 1952. Not only the content but also the form had to be brought rigorously in line with communist ideology. Unfortunately Lenin and the Old Bolsheviks had said very little about theatre and drama and Karl Marx hardly mentions them. The communist dictators were free, therefore, to evolve their own dogma about how the arts must be made to conform to communist teaching. Under the dogma, as they evolved and applied it, it is difficult to see how any artistic, dramatic, or theatre endeavor could survive. It is a sad and tragic story that Gorchakov tells.

It is so sad, so completely devastating, that one is inclined in reading this book to set some of it down to the author's thesis and his obvious detestation of all things communist. Undoubtedly this attitude does color his account. Nevertheless, I repeat, he has written a valuable history of the Russian theatre in the twentieth century. His study not only makes a coherent whole, it is also apparently fully documented. I say apparently, for his sources are in Russia and not available to me. Finally, the translator must be congratulated for his excellent rendering of this study into readable English and the publishers for their fine job of printing. The considerable number of illustrations are not as good as one would like, probably because the original photographs that were available were none too sharp. They

are nevertheless of considerable aid to the student of theatre.

HUBERT HEFFNER
Indiana University

ETHEREGE AND THE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY COMEDY OF MANNERS. By Dale Underwood. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957; pp. x+165. $4.00.

It seems unbelievable that the first book-length critical study devoted to so important a dramatist as Sir George Etherege has but just appeared almost three hundred years after the first playing of *The Man of Mode*. And it is gratifying to report that this effort by Professor Dale Underwood of Yale is for the most part one of distinction. In addition to an astute consideration of Etherege's three plays, here is offered, as the dust jacket promises, " a new and enlarged interpretation of the comedy of manners." By redefining the intellectual and dramatic backgrounds of the Etheregean plays, Professor Underwood attempts "to alter the most common assumptions concerning this body of drama." In a full, meticulous examination of historical concepts he shows that the materials, interests, and form of Restoration comedy had become an established part of comedy practice by 1642. Professor Underwood investigates the continuity—"on grounds different from those previously investigated"—of dramatic traditions from Jonson and Fletcher, and to a lesser degree from Lyly and Shakespeare, to Etherege and his contemporaries. He provides a scholarly clarification of the three philosophic lines of thought generally discovered at work in Restoration comedy: Epicureanism, skepticism, and a type of primitivism or naturalism. He then examines the modifications of these historical traditions by Restoration dramatists, especially Etherege, which resulted in a comedy distinctive in spirit and purpose.

This book is a condensed dissertation, solid, significant, and perceptive; but it suffers in places on stylistic grounds by the complexity of its composition and the dutiful massing of evidence. Perhaps a more serious shortcoming, in the opinion of this reviewer, is the fact that while the author is not unmindful that the chief materials of drama, apart from language, are "characters, actions, and settings," his approach to the Etheregean comedies is not made in dramatic or theatrical terms. Consequently, there are some strained inferences. Who, while witnessing *The Comical Revenge*—if he is fortunate enough to discover a production of the play somewhere—will discern through the action and the characters that the central action of the play, beyond the representation of the comedy of a libertine "caught in the snare of custom," is a movement projecting "the fall of man from a state of grace through the defects of nature"? Professor Underwood himself admits that all the aspects of meaning which he discovers here are "yet to be articulated in the development of the action itself."

Although several of Professor Underwood's conclusions are subject to individual subscription, in his main concern, which is to examine "the formal nature of the plays" in order to discover the larger dramatic designs, he is eminently successful. Commenting on the ambiguity and the ironic form of *The Man of Mode*, for example, he finds no indication of a set of values by which the frivolity of the society of the participants in the comedy could be judged. Etherege, rather, in this satire of the leisure class devoted to pleasure saw sterility, but during his stint in public service at Ratisbon he saw the same attributes of pettiness and amorality "in the traditionally worthier of man's endeavors and aspirations." He judged neither world worthier or less comic than the other, as his own private affairs attest. "Thus the fact that his plays offer no alternative to the frivolity which they expose," Professor Underwood concludes, "would seem to indicate for their author the final comedy of man."

KALMAN A. BURNIM
Valparaiso University

MEDIEVAL ENGLISH POETRY: THE NON-CHAUCERIAN TRADITION. By John Speirs. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 406. $6.50

Mr. Speirs' volume makes the excellent sense of gathering together some of his various essays and notions which have appeared fugitively in *Scrutiny* and the Pelican *Age of Chaucer*. His scope is wide: Speirs ranges from early Breton lays like the delightful locally colored "Sir Orfeo" (which places Winchester in Thrace!), through that alliterative medieval masterpiece *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, down to certain of the Towneley plays (for instance, the vastly comic *Noah* play, attributed to the Wakefield Master). More broadly, the author winds up his book with a stunning comparative cultural study, "The Relationship between the Literature and the Painting and Sculpture in Medieval England."

Nevertheless, Mr. Speirs *has* limited his study, so that the so-called Scottish Chaucerians, William Dunbar and Robert Henryson, receive short shrift. As for Chaucer, *despite* his title, Speirs does pay that poet considerable attention, but it seems impossible *not* to deal with Chaucer in writing about "that misty time," in which, as Sir Philip Sidney's *Defense* has pointed out, Chaucer alone "could see so clearly."

Mr. Speirs bestows the cachet of "great" on the anonymous romance, *Gawayne*—and rightly so; he relates the poem to important issues in literature, mythology, and anthropology. Speirs does face up to the enormous difficulties of diction in *Gawayne*: he points out that its dialect (North-West Midlands) has not survived as *our* dialect. For instance, with the commonplace word man, *Gawayne* presents a treasure-trove of vanished Norse and various other returned loan-words: e.g., tulk, burne, segg, gome, lude, hathel, etc., the bulk of which would be inscrutable even to a reader of Thomas Malory and Thomas More. Nevertheless, any effort expended in reading *Gawayne* becomes surely worth it. The poem represents a thirteenth-century survival of the greatness of the *Beowulf*, and *Gawayne* does not indicate that falling off, indeed, the denigration, of the Scandinavian hero as exemplified by two of its contemporary lays, "King Horn" and "Havelok the Dane," which as Speirs attests, introduced the substantive "matter of England." Speirs rams home the fact that both the language and the lesson of the diverse temptations of Gawayne (thrice of the flesh in his bed-chamber, and once of courage on the field of the painfully pledged word) should be better known to all students of literature. The achievement of both Gawayne and the Green Knight, with their complexities, foibles, and strengths—in a word, humanity—evidences once more the lesson of the Spinozistic *Ethics*, that things worth having are often hard to come by and, perhaps, for that reason too, are all the more desirable to strive for.

HERBERT C. FEINSTEIN
University of California, Berkeley

THE ASTOR PLACE RIOT. By Richard Moody. Illustrated. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958; pp. xii+243. $5.00.

I wish it were possible to say that theatrical scholarship has been a flourishing enterprise in our time in America. But if it becomes one in the near future we shall be specifically indebted to Professor Richard Moody. He made an auspicious beginning in 1955 with his study of our Romantic theatre, *America Takes the Stage*, and has now given us an engrossing account of the most dramatic episode of our theatrical history, the Astor Place Riot of May 10, 1849. Vividly written and dramatically organized, the book is virtually the first non-biographical work that gives American theatrical scholarship literary status in the book market and the library. It can be read with interest purely as a story and enjoyed for its "characters" and "plot." At the same time, it is informative both to the student of the American theatre and the social historian, for Mr. Moody rightly locates his narrative in a context of social conflicts as well as of theatrical rivalries.

Thirty-one people were killed, 150 wounded, eighty-six arrested, and ten convicted as a result of the riot that nearly wrecked the Astor Place Opera House when the partisans of Edwin Forrest endeavored to prevent Macready's appearance in *Macbeth* while Forrest was playing the same role in New York. The relationship between Edwin Forrest, the idol of American audiences, and the older British tragedian William Macready had been started pleasantly enough when the American made his first appearance in London and was well received by the British star. Relations deteriorated only on a subsequent visit in 1845 when Forrest was hissed in London for his Othello and was frustrated in his efforts to play with an English company in Paris and to acquire the right to present the plays of Macready's friend Bulwer-Lytton. Forrest, suspecting Macready's fine English hand behind these setbacks, retaliated by hissing the British actor in Edinburgh at a performance of *Hamlet*. Accusations and explanations multiplied, and when Macready and Forrest opened in New York in the same play, *Macbeth*, on the same night, events moved toward a crisis. Forrest's partisans made it impossible for the visiting star and his company to be heard, so that the performance had to be given virtually in pantomime. This demonstration of ill will occurred on May 7, 1849, and discretion would have prevented the fatal riot. But Macready had admirers in America and allowed himself to be persuaded to give a second performance on May 10. The consequences were the riot that Mr. Moody describes so well after building up to it in a masterly fashion.

More important, however, than an altercation between actors and their followers was the

social conflict associated with the demonstrations against Macready. These demonstrated a cleavage between an educated American gentry and a boisterous democratic faction, nativist and "Know-Nothingist," which gave vent to its hatred of "aristocracy" and its xenophobia, as well as to its high spirits, in taking Forrest's part. There is no evidence that the conflict involved any esthetic issue such as the divergent acting styles of the fastidious Briton and the athletic American. Mr. Moody rightly gives little attention to these differences, although it is true, of course, that Forrest's acting style and his rhetorical flourishes in public appeals had just the kind of bravura that his countrymen identified with democratic vigor. We are thrust into politics and political consciousness when we join the Forrest-Macready quarrel. Yet we should be accused of insensibility if we did not discover in Mr. Moody's evidence overtones of tragedy that deepen his narrative and add poignancy to it. Macready, for all his apparent pettiness and snobbery, emerges as an obsessed and self-tormenting personality, harrassed by consciousness of advancing age and declining popularity. Melville might have created him as a character akin to his Bartleby the Scrivener, and indeed as a projection of himself, too. The embittered actor, who committed his self-appraisals and regrets to his *Diaries* (published in two volumes in 1912), retired in February 1851, and spent the last twenty-two years of his life in relative obscurity. His rival went on from triumph to triumph on the American stage. The Astor Place Opera House also had a dramatic career. It suffered one fiasco after another until the theatre and its furnishings were put up for sale in 1853; from 1854, the building, renamed Clinton Hall, was the headquarters of the Mercantile Library Association, the largest book market in the city, for thirty-six years until demolished in 1890. Mr. Moody has made the most of his matter of a theatre and two actors, a city and its rabble, and of a destiny that embraces cabbages and kings, the mimic kings of the stage.

JOHN GASSNER
Yale University

THE THEATRE OF ROBERT EDMOND JONES. Edited and with a chronology by Ralph Pendleton. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1958; pp. xii+196. $12.50.

As the first and foremost designer in the twentieth-century American theatre Robert Edmond Jones deserved a book in his honor, and Ralph Pendleton has assembled the appropriate tribute: a handsome volume, more than half of it given over to Jones's designs and the remainder to a chronology of his career and to eulogies contributed by his friends and professional associates.

The short essays do not pretend to be studies in depth of Jones the man or Jones the artist. They are profile sketches, but being eulogistic, they repeatedly reveal striking insights into his character as man and as artist.

In the initial essay Stark Young credits Jones with giving the clue to the true appreciation of his designs. The first obligation of the scenic artist, Jones said, was to catch in the mind's eye the "high original intention of the dramatist," the second, "to affirm and ennoble the art of the actors." Lee Simonson, in his comments, dwells on Jones's crusade for an ideal theatre in which its "ancient mystery and its ancient awe" might be restored.

Jo Mielziner and Donald Oenslager, both of whom began their distinguished careers as apprentices to Jones, contribute sidelights on his working methods. Mielziner was first struck by his painstaking attention to lighting, and later by his equally meticulous care with costumes. "The problem of costume," he once said, "is the problem of the man who wears it and of what he is trying to do and say in it." Oenslager describes Jones as "a remarkably perceptive artist and an unerring craftsman," and analyzes his sketches and working drawings for *Lute Song* to illustrate his point.

Kenneth Macgowan touches on Jones's career as director and designer at the Provincetown Playhouse and on his brief experience as a movie designer. In everything he did, Macgowan observes, there was an "ordered efficiency."

The biographical essay by Mary Hall Furber, a family friend, and the chronology by Pendleton supply information about Jones and his career that heretofore has not been readily available. And John Mason Brown's "*L'Envoi*" captures in a few phrases the nature of the man and of the artist: "'Lustrous' was a favorite word of Bobby's," and the "one which most accurately describes" the quality of his settings and sketches. He was a "magnificent dreamer whose genius it was to transmute his dreams into reality." And for him the theatre was not, as it is for many, a night off; for "Bobby it was a night on."

The greatest delight is, of course, to be

found in the fifty-one full-page plates including the well-known sketches for *Macbeth* and for *The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife.*

RICHARD MOODY
Indiana University

J. B. By Archibald MacLeish. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958; pp. 153. $3.50.

Archibald MacLeish has achieved a great deal in his verse drama, *J. B.* He has shown the modern implications of the Book of Job by giving it a contemporary setting. In the circus-tent arrangement and the vendors who play God and Satan he has invented an interesting device for presenting his story. Certain of the incidents he has made quite dramatic: for instance, the messengers' reportings of the children's deaths. Moreover, he has raised several provocative questions regarding the Job story. An example is Nickles, as the Devil, taunting Mr. Zuss with the suggestion that God is not satisfied with Job's faith until Job suffers bodily pain; in Nickles' words, "God always asks the proof of pain." Finally, Mr. MacLeish has written some first-rate stage verse. A line such as

the earth
Smell remembers that there was a man

is effective in the theatre.

It is precisely because of these accomplishments, however, that the shortcomings of the play are so noticeable; the same areas in which it succeeds are also areas in which it fails. The dramatic episodes are altogether too infrequent; the flashes of insight are intermittent and isolated; and the verse is inconsistent, being at times too colloquial and at other times pretentious. Related to these faults, and perhaps more important, is the absence of a frame of reference or point of view in the play. In every successful dramatization of mythical or religious material, whether it is Sophocles' treatment of the Electra myth or Giraudoux's *The Trojan War Will Not Take Place,* the original story has been remade, from first to last, into something which is entirely the author's. This is a requirement not of academic criticism but of the form itself, and it is this requirement which Mr. MacLeish has failed to meet. Apparently overawed by both the material and the issues it deals with, he has been content merely to modernize the story and to raise questions concerning it; but he has not transformed it into a coherent whole which we recognize as his vision. The result is confusion. The Distant Voice, which is heard at various times in the play, is a good example. It is never explained or integrated into the play and consequently we do not know how to interpret it. Is it only in the imaginations of the vendors, or is it really the Voice of God? After all, it does speak God's words in the Bible. And just as we are not clear on this matter, so are we not clear on the play itself. If, as some lines suggest, the point is that through his endurance it is man who wins and not God, then this point should be made not in a few lines but in the play as a whole.

In spite of its shortcomings, however, *J. B.* is a worthwhile dramatic piece and we should be grateful to Mr. MacLeish for occasional language and thoughts of a caliber which are seldom experienced in the theatre of today.

E. E. WILSON, JR.
Hofstra College

THE PLAYWRIGHT'S ART: STAGE, RADIO, TELEVISION, MOTION PICTURES. By Roger M. Busfield, Jr. New York: Harper, 1958; pp. xi+260. $3.00.

"There may be four dramatic media, but there remains only one dramatic writer," says Professor Busfield; and he counters the current tendency to label and subdivide the work of the dramatist according to the medium by which it is displayed.

The author has directed his book toward young writers who are making first attempts at drama. He does not deal with mechanical techniques of any of the four forms; nor does he bring any fresh insight to dramatic theory that might interest the scholar, critic, or professional dramatist. Rather, he has written a readable, interesting outline of basic dramaturgy that has sound application to stage writing and theoretical, if not always practical, application to the other three fields.

The publisher's notes credit the author with making skillful use of what playwrights have said about their craft. Unfortunately, to judge by this book, contemporary playwrights have not said much about their craft. As a result, the reader is apt to become impatient with the almost endless quotations from Belasco, Broadhurst, Fitch, Davis, *et al.*, and to yearn fruitlessly for a few words from Messrs. Miller, Williams, Inge, or others of more current interest.

One also misses a point of view on the inevitable and perplexing writing-class question: "Should I write a 'good' play or one that will sell?" A pat reply of "both" is insufficient when

dealing with fields other than the stage, as Professor Busfield is doing here. The omission is especially noticeable because he places almost dual emphasis upon idealistic theory and upon the practical importance of getting one's plays produced at any cost.

Though these reservations should be noted, the book has many things in its favor. The sections dealing with the standard problems of dramatic writing are sound and clear, as are the beginning passages treating artistic theory and dramatic instinct. There are helpful discussions of collaboration, adaptation, rewriting during rehearsal, and a final chapter on business and career information for the student who hopes to write plays professionally. The appendix lists a series of individual and group exercises, some Mr. Busfield's, others used by teachers of playwriting in colleges and universities. Most teachers should find intriguing suggestions in this section, while also encountering some that seem ridiculous, according to one's own aproach.

For the professor seeking a text to provide students with a quick background for more specific lecture and discussion sessions, *The Playwright's Art* deserves careful consideration.

JERRY C. MCNEELY
University of Wisconsin

LITERATURE CONSIDERED AS PHILOSOPHY: THE FRENCH EXAMPLE. By Everett W. Knight. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. xvi+290. $5.00.

This study as the title indicates is designed to show that literature for many years had nothing to say because science would and did state basic truths. This void, however, was filled by a movement titled existentialism which quickly supplied a true basis for the content of literature. The synthesis was accomplished by a dependence on philosophy. It was argued that if truth is a part of existence, then it is for everyone and, it becomes a function of literature.

Professor Everett W. Knight has made a concise, precise, and tightly written statement, which, with the keen eye of a philosopher for unraveling each facet of rational thinking, significantly details the developments leading to the "philosophy" called existentialism, particularly that form which is associated with the figure of the French playwright and novelist, Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-).

Professor Knight rightly points out that existentialism is a movement rather than a "philosophy" or an idea. As a movement, it escapes precise definition. However, it has tenets which may be attached to significant statements. Here are several. Existentialism seeks to make thought conform to life. It deals with life as it is. Being is synonymous with action; hence, to be is identical with to act. It is a revolution and as such is in opposition to the established order of thought. Rejection is a basic tenet. The ideal of life as it ought to be is put aside for life as it is. But life is absurd. Order is discredited. So, also, are classical thought along with traditionalism and rationalism. Sartre (in *L'Etre et le Néant* [*Being and Nothingness*]) accounts for all human activity entirely in terms of the fusion of being and nothingness. The point hinges on the affirmation of being, a statement of appearance and existence which is developed in two points: the in-itself which is everything that exists (material things, dreams, memory, etc.), and the for-itself (a consciousness that is never aware of itself apart from the in-itself) which is a nothingness that may be described as a mental image.

This book is a competent analysis of a prevailing trait of French intellectuals. They insist on setting up a rationale which will explain all things and codify these items in a neat pattern. As a consequence, these same Frenchmen will quickly be associated with cliques, coteries, splinter-groups, etc. with barriers not to be transcended. This intellectual vacuity produces strange bedfellows and brings down governments rather than relinquishing a point.

Professor Knight patiently unfolds the development of existentialism by dividing the topic into three parts. He treats the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), who stresses a careful description of things as a basis for action. In the second part, he considers the novels of André Gide (1869-1951), André Malraux (1895-), and Antoine de Saint-Exupéry (1900-1945), who state in literature what Sartre attempts to say in the language of "philosophy." And he concludes with Sartre.

Sartre's long shadow is cast throughout the study which will be of interest to theatre people for Sartre has brought existentialism to the theatre. Whether this study will be immediately helpful to the director of *No Exit* or *The Flies* is a point of interest. Philosophical acumen is required to digest the contents. For one with this facility, however, the study is admirable.

JOHN H. MCDOWELL
The Ohio State University

THE USE OF POETRY AND THE USE OF CRITICISM. By T. S. Eliot. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1958; pp. 156. $2.75.

These studies in the relation of criticism to poetry were originally presented by Mr. Eliot as the Charles Eliot Norton lectures at Harvard University in 1932-1933. They were first published in England by Faber and Faber, Ltd., in 1933; they have been reprinted nearly a dozen times since. The present volume is apparently simply a reissue, for the United States, of the Faber and Faber publication.

The periodic reprinting of the volume bears testimony to its continuing usefulness in contemporary critical thinking. While Mr. Eliot's prose style in the early thirties now proves occasionally provoking in its rather elaborate cloaking of personal critical judgments in protestations of innocence about scholarship, the book still speaks challengingly on the progress of criticism and the nature of poetry. One is constantly reminded of Eliot's debt, in 1933, to I. A. Richards. It is true of this volume, as it is perhaps true of much of Eliot's criticism, that its virtues lie in flashes of insight to be found in individual pages of the book rather than in any sustained argument to be found in the whole.

The introduction is particularly interesting in the light of developments in criticism *since* 1933. Much contemporary work seems to spring from the wish expressed by Eliot that "we might dispose more attention to the correctness of expression, to the clarity or obscurity, to the grammatical precision or inaccuracy, to the choice of words whether just or improper, exalted or vulgar, of our verse." It is perhaps not frequently enough repeated, too, that "the development of genuine taste, founded on genuine feeling, is inextricable from the development of the personality and character."

Chapter II, devoted to the problem of dramatic form and the problem of verse technique in Elizabethan criticism, no longer seems particularly illuminating. The chapter on Wordsworth and Coleridge is, I think, inadequate to its subject. The chapter on Shelley and Keats is of particular interest for its high praise of Keats; Eliot confesses a distaste for Shelley's poetry, and he finds the distaste to arise not from irrelevant prejudices in himself but from the nature of the poetry.

The chapter on Matthew Arnold is somewhat supercilious in its style, but the remarks are still very much worth reading. Doubtless Eliot would not be so good a critic of Arnold if he were more warmly disposed towards Shelley. It is within this chapter that Eliot writes: "The reason why some criticism is good . . . is that the critic assumes, in a way, the personality of the author whom he criticises, and through this personality is able to speak with his own voice."

WALLACE A. BACON
Northwestren University

THE DIMENSIONS OF ROBERT FROST. By Reginald L. Cook. New York: Rinehart, 1958; pp. xii + 241. $3.95.

This study of one who has been called our best known and best loved modern poet is authoritative and lively. Though it grows out of Professor Cook's thirty years of friendship and association with Robert Frost, it is not biography but literary criticism, happily free from irrelevant details of the poet's idiosyncrasies and personal behavior. Some five hundred quotations from Frost's conversations and lectures (identified in an appendix; there are no footnotes) and an equivalent number of quotations from artists and critics of the past two thousand years form the basis for a sound critical judgment of the poet and his works, entirely free from metaphysical or imagist preconceptions and free also from mere adulatory encomium. Professor Cook keeps his eye steadily on the poet and his craftsmanship. He tells us what Frost says, not what he wore when he said it or what he had had for dinner. He writes with the simplicity, freshness, and wit that are so characteristic of Frost himself, both in his talk and in his poetry, and there emerges a clear conception of the poet as poet, an illumination of his poetry, an exploration of his recurrent themes, and a revealing explanation of his poetic theory—all against a solid background of fundamental and timeless concepts of literary and artistic creation. Especially appealing to students of oral interpretation will be his development of the point that Frost's utterances are "earmarked by rhythm and pitched to the tone of the speaking voice," that "in Frost's poetry the meaning is partly in the tone," in "the arrangement of words in sequences of sound." (His treatment of this point borrows from his recent essay in the *QJS*.) All those who wish to read Frost's poetry to others will do well to familiarize themselves with this critique. One can endorse without reservation the statement on the jacket that "anyone who finds this book in his hands will

finish it understanding Frost better, liking him more, and wishing to discover his poetry afresh."

W. M. PARRISH
University of Illinois, Emeritus

ORAL INTERPRETATION AND LITERARY STUDY. By Don Geiger. San Francisco: Pieter Van Vloten, 1958; pp. 80. $2.00.

This little book, addressed, the author states, to "the renewed interest in public reading," consists of four essays, three of which were delivered as lectures for a Symposium in Oral Interpretation at Northwestern University. Titles of the essays are: "Oral Interpretation and Literary Study"; "Oral Interpretation as an Art of Communication"; "The Expression of the Oral Interpreter"; and "Emotion in Poetry: The Oral Interpreter's Special Responsibility."

Viewing oral interpretation as an art in its own right, the author finds it an art which in a special way can illuminate the meanings of literature and bring the experience of the piece of writing to the hearer in a particularly vivid manner. In these days of Mickey Spillane and Jack the Ripper, one agrees that "literature requires plain readers who prize it." The public reader is in position to encourage such appreciation, and thus public reading has social as well as aesthetic value.

Throughout the book the author reveals keen awareness of the relationship between critical study, as part of the oral interpreter's responsibility, and a reader's performance. He envisions interpretation as an "amalgam of acting, public speaking, critical reaction, and sympathetic sharing," listing specific means by which the interpreter can express elements of the text. Views of both object-oriented and emotion-oriented critics are presented, with the conclusion that the reader must be cognizant of both emotion and object and that the emotion of the poem depends upon the objects or situation presented. The possibility is seen that the oral interpreter can convey "with some precision and richness a complex of emotions" which defy labelling with precise terms.

This is a slim volume, but it shows sound scholarship, and the writing is clear, succinct, and provocative, being no rehash of time-worn, textbook ideas. Teachers of speech and English will welcome such a book.

ALETHEA SMITH MATTINGLY
University of Arizona

AUDIOLOGY: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE. By Hayes A. Newby. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958; pp. ix+342. $6.00.

This is a how-to-do-it textbook, *it* being largely the testing of hearing. This scope of the subject matter of the book is especially worth noting: *audiology* is of recent minting and somewhat in search of a definition. Newby puts the word in quotation marks, stipulates that it stands for the study of hearing and hearing disorders, rewords and limits this, "the measurement of hearing loss and the rehabilitation of those with hearing impairments," and documents the whole with a definition by nine outstanding audiologists who are consultants to the Veteran's Administration. Three of these (or a successor and similar group enumerated in the Preface) are members of the American Psychological Association. One of the three lists his interests in the *APA Directory* as audiology, auditory psychophysics, and rehabilitation of auditorily impaired; another as audiology, audition, and psychophysics. In short, some prominent audiologists hardly trust the term for defining a particular segment of study related to hearing.

A between-the-lines interpretation to be made from this book is the place of the audiologist in our diagnostic-therapeutic milieu. He seems destined to be the medic's technician. This outcome, which many of us fear as inevitable, seems to be taken for granted by Newby. Could this relate to the circumstance that audiology (and speech correction) at Stanford (Newby's school) is in the School of Medicine?

The measurement of impaired hearing and the diagnosis of the *patient* (the term is stressed in the book) are competently handled indeed. Speech audiometry, excellently! This plethora of detail does not carry over to the discussion of rehabilitation. Indeed the reader would be hard put to it to plan a program of auditory training with this book as his guide; yet herein might well be the core of audiology if it is to be other than a sub-professional group, "otological technicians."

The genesis of *Audiology: Principles and Practice* lies more with the healing arts than in experimental approaches to a sense modality. This may be proper or it may be an indictment. The reliability of tests, the concept of probability in languages, the gain functions of verbal test materials, the psychophysical method of limits and method of adjustment—surely these are among the topics that are pertinent to audiology and, if treated, would make this textbook more palatable to deans of liberal

arts colleges and graduate schools and less of a recipe manual.

Possibly Newby would maintain that audiology is out of place in any but a professional or technical school. In many universities, however, it remains in the Arts College and spills over into the Graduate School.

I shall, of course, use this textbook if the occasion arises. Even if the esoteric content to which I have alluded is put between covers, Newby's book is needed for practical reasons.

JOHN W. BLACK
The Ohio State University

THE DEVELOPMENT AND DISORDERS OF SPEECH IN CHILDHOOD. By Muriel E. Morley. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1957; pp. xviii+440. $9.00.

This book is a unique contribution since it considers disorders and defects of speech and language in relation to the developmental process. The author brings to the writing of this book the knowledge and point of view of a speech therapist, an appreciation of the physical and biological processes, and an understanding of the concept of development. Although the book draws upon a substantial variety of published research, it is based in large part upon the research and remediation experience of the author. It includes the results of the observation of speech and language development in all children born in an English community during May and June 1947, the more detailed study of 114 children who are a representative sample of the community group, and a detailed study of the incidence and type of speech disorders of 162 children with speech problems between the ages of five and fifteen years.

Developmental, deviant, and remedial content are presented in six sections. One deals with the patterns of speech development as they emerged from the community study and includes discussions of the method of investigation, the development of normal speech and speech disorders in the first seven years of life, and their relationship to sex, position in the family, socioeconomic status, and various environmental conditions. Another considers the delayed development of speech in relation to mental retardation, hearing defects, and aphasia. A section on defective articulation presents a discussion of types and etiology of defects and some general principles for the treatment of defective articulation which may be due to causes such as partial hearing loss and structural abnormalities. The last three sections discuss the symptoms and treatment of stammering, speech disorders in twins, and the relation between lateral dominance and speech development and disorder.

Only in the 37 tables in the appendix is there any indication of the statistical treatment of the data presented. The text presents 90 figures on a variety of topics such as illustrative audiograms, post-operative speech aids, anatomical drawings, graphs showing development of the use of words, phrases, and intelligible speech in the representative sample of children and in the sample with defective articulation, and the phonetic transcription of defects of articulation.

The book attempts to consider the development of speech, disorders of speech as related to development, and some principles for diagnosis and rehabilitation of speech disorders. It may be that this very broad purpose at times forces brief, dogmatic statements or the glossing over of material, while at other times procedures are precisely described and the discussion is adequate. Despite this spottiness, however, the book contains a wealth of material, and is of particular value because content from several fields is included in the general interpretation and presentation.

MILDRED C. TEMPLIN
University of Minnesota

AND SO WE SPEAK: VOICE AND ARTICULATION. By Johnnye Akin. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1958; pp. xxii+249. $6.00.

This book has been sorely needed for years. Written to be used as a text for either voice and diction courses or for a beginning course in phonetics, the context is concise and easy to follow. The book is divided into two parts, articulation and voice, respectively. The part on articulation begins with a chapter answering the questions, "Why improve speech?" and "how?" This is followed with a detailed presentation of each of the speech sounds. Vowels are taken up in the order in which they appear on the vowel chart, beginning with the high-front [i] and ending with the high-back [u]. The central vowel sounds are presented last. Each of the diphthongs is then presented and then the consonants. The part on articulation emphasizes not only the correct formation of the sounds but socially acceptable pronunciation as well. The author makes clear that "socially acceptable" pronunciation in a dialect area is determined by those inhabitants in the area who use cultivated speech.

The voice section of the book contains an excellent discussion of the principles of voice production and their relationships to effective speech. Brief discussions of various functional and organic dysphonias are also included. Of particular value is the chapter entitled, "Audition of Speech." The student must recognize the necessity for changing his listening habits as he changes his improper speech habits.

Even though the book was written for voice and diction courses and for beginning phonetics, certain of its features lend themselves particularly well for speech correction. Especially will teachers of the deaf and hard-of-hearing find the book invaluable. Consonant sounds are taken up in order of their simplicity and "visibility" with progression to the more complicated and less "visible." Each consonant and vowel sound is illustrated by a median section drawing showing the correct positions of the speech organs for the production of the sound. In addition, each consonant sound is labelled with its physio-phonetic description. A concise verbal description of the placement of the speech organs is also given in each case. Words illustrating common usages of each sound, together with words illustrating deviant usages, follow the placement descriptions. Exercise word lists are arranged in order of initial, final, and medial positions of the sounds in words. There are also numerous exercises for sound discrimination, and correction of such voice problems as pitch pattern, monotony, etc.

This text obviously represents much careful thought and preparation.

JAMES H. PLATT
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College

PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Raymond G. Smith. New York: Ronald Press, 1958; pp. vi+376. $4.25.

The style and scope of this textbook are well described in the opening lines of the Preface: "Many of the precepts of public speaking are as old as the beginnings of science and art, but research within the last thirty years has brought new viewpoints to the field." The introduction tells of the importance of communication in modern society, and guides the student through the preliminary problems of speech preparation and delivery. "The Audience" is appropriately and effectively analyzed in Part II. The classical flavor, present throughout, is found particularly in chapters on speech materials (Part III) and in later chapters (Part IV) on the development of appeals in the speech. Part V, titled "The Speaker," treats in detail the aspects of speech delivery, with a final chapter on "Listening and Evaluating."

Contemporary references include a very large number of master's and doctoral studies in speech, as well as reported research in related areas. Teaching aids include questions based on each of the chapters, many lists of suggested readings, assignments, projects, and several rating forms.

The seriousness of purpose of this text is evident in its typography. While the printed page is easily read, and headings and subheadings are readily identified, the public speaking student is not beguiled by photographs, line drawings, or stick figures. There are light graphs and charts dealing with textual concepts. Professor Smith has in mind "those beginning students who have had some prior speech experience, or have a strong desire to improve their speaking skills."

This book, therefore, should be considered for prospective adoption within the author's stated purpose.

HAYDEN K. CARRUTH
University of Michigan

PRACTICAL SPEAKING FOR THE TECHNICAL MAN. By John Erb Dietrich and Keith Brooks. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1958; pp. ix+310. $6.00.

"The Technical Man" for whom this book is written is the undergraduate in engineering or a similar curriculum who takes a basic speech course to learn communication techniques. It assumes that the course should be tailored to the student's technical interest, and claims two "unique features" at the end of each chapter: "*Apply the Principles* and a *Formula*." The former, a series of "exercises for the purpose of focusing the technologist's attention on the main features of the chapter," is a standard textbook practice competently applied. The "Formula" is quite another thing. The authors attempt a sort of algebraic summation of each chapter. For instance, one chapter yields the formula: "$BVFD = \frac{BA}{PFDGI}$," which is to say, "*Be Visually Forceful* and *Direct* putting *Purpose, Force, Directness, Genuineness* and *Interpretation* into your *Bodily Activity*." Because these formulae have the form but not the substance of their mathematical counterparts they add little to the clarity or intellectual content of the text. They appear as a gimmick,

encouraging rote learning rather than aiding comprehension and application.

In several instances the authors are not clear. Speaking of voice, they observe: "The strident, whiny nasal twang suggests a person who is unpleasant and self-centered. The full round hearty pleasant voice might imply a person with these same characteristics." This is almost certain to leave the student perplexed. Again, the four subheads under the paragraph heading *"What Makes A Good Gesture?"* are, "A. Hands in the pockets, B. Let gestures be natural, C. Enlarge your natural gestures, and D. Feel free to gesture abundantly." The first of these is neither the grammatical parallel of the others nor does it stand in the same relation to the major point.

The typography of the book leaves much to be desired. Errors run the gamut from simple mistakes in spelling, through variations of phrases which are intended to be identical (the list of nine "Keys to Effective Speech" appears in the introduction to Chapter 2 including "Making It Interesting," while in the Table of Contents and the text of the chapter it reads "Make It Interesting," in the same way the others are phrased), to a misplaced line of type in the material discussing "Attention."

The most competent and useful parts of the book deal with the oral technical report and with manuscript reading. The chapter discussing the former is more clear and interesting than the more abstract treatment of speech organization and material. Manuscript reading is presented as a useful tool for certain occasions, worthy of special study and practice.

Practical Speaking for the Technical Man is disappointing. Clarity and typographical accuracy are essential in a text. The publisher, the authors, and the students lose when these are not consistently present.

H. L. Ewbank, Jr.
Purdue University

BRIEFLY NOTED

THE LUNTS. By George Freedley. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 134. $4.50.

This attractive little volume is *Theatre World Monograph No. 10.* It provides an interesting record of the Lunts' careers from their early successes down to *The Great Sebastians.*

The author writes from an unusual background of experience as a former student of Baker at Yale; a stage designer, technical director, and actor with the Theatre Guild; and the curator of the New York Library's theatre collection, for the past twenty years.

There are 4 pages of front matter, 4 pages of index, 58 pages of text proper, 47 pages of pictures, and 21 pages of summaries of the careers of Lynn Fontanne and Alfred Lunt. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of unnecessary duplication in the separate chronologies of these two lives which, since 1922, have been so closely integrated.

While there is much interesting information in the book, the critical appraisals of these world-renowned artists are disappointingly sketchy and superficial. Perhaps it is too soon to expect anything approaching a definitive work. However that many be, this brief treatment of the matchless acting team will be a valuable addition to theatre libraries.

Despite the profuse and excellent illustrations, it seems difficult to justify the $4.50 price.

A. T. Weaver
University of Wisconsin

THE DRAMATIC EXPERIENCE. By Judah Bierman, James Hart, and Stanley Johnson. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1958; pp. viii+519. $5.75.

This book has an obviously well-worn plan but also an illuminating commentary that makes it one of the more valuable anthologies of recent years. A discerning introduction on how to read drama is shrewdly illustrated by *The Desperate Hours,* to emphasize the element of action; *Everyman,* the element of theme; and *Abe Lincoln in Illinois,* the element of character. All these elements are demonstrated in balance in *The Wild Duck.* Part Two briefly but sharply analyzes the major modes of comedy and tragedy. The former is illustrated by *The Time of Your Life, Caesar and Cleopatra,* and *Twelfth Night;* the latter, by *Oedipus Rex, Othello, Blood Wedding,* and *Death of a Salesman.* The introduction to each play is not only an excellent discussion of the play itself but is especially valuable in the way it compares the preceding plays with the present one, revealing that the differences do not eliminate the basic similarities that relate each example to either the comic or the tragic vision. If, for some teachers, the included plays are not different enough from those in other anthologies, or sufficient in number to make this collection a good economic choice as a text for a dramatic

literature class, the commentary should certainly be of real value to any teacher and student.

W. J. FRIEDERICH
Marietta College

MODERN THEATRE LIGHTING. By Wayne Bowman, illustrations by Jean Bowman. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. 224. $3.75.

In its clarity, *Modern Theatre Lighting* is a positive contribution to the teaching of stage lighting. It makes no pretense of contributing to the improvement of the art itself, except in its training of later contributors.

Through experience I fully appreciate the paradox again evidenced in the title; only four of fourteen chapters deal directly with actual lighting design. However, if one keeps in mind the purpose, as stated in a better than average introduction, the inclusion of the chapters on physics is justified by the average theatre student's lack of this background.

The illustrations are excellent, simple and clear. The six photographic plates might have been more valuable if accompanied by ground plans showing details of light sources and their positions.

Some of the means of producing plasticity have been omitted. In the chapter, "The Process of Lighting the Play," the transition from the play analysis to the actual placement of instruments is sudden and incomplete, a rather common weakness in lighting books.

The chapter on electrical practices, while good in the number included, might have been further improved by ranking the circuit malfunctions in order of frequency of occurrence. The discussion of dimmers should have included mention of the two newest types.

With minor objections, I would think that this text coupled with class-discussed assignments in lighting design would provide a good stage lighting course.

WALTER S. DEWEY
The Ohio State University

THE MARIONETTE. By George Merten. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1958; pp. 160. Paper $3.00, cloth $5.00.

THE HAND PUPPETS. By George Merten. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1958; pp. 160. Paper $3.00, cloth $5.00.

Relatively little that is new has been written in recent years on how to make and use puppets, but in these two books readers will find a wealth of material exceptionally well organized and easy to follow. Step-by-step instructions for construction, manipulation, and presentation of various puppet types are given in outline form with a plentiful supply of photographs and diagrams closely accompanying the text. In *The Marionette*, the author reintroduces the upright control widely used in Europe and gives its advantages as he sees them over the horizontal or airplane control more popular in this country. Since he is acknowledged internationally as an accomplished performer, his recommendation should carry considerable weight. Two sample puppet plays with suggestions for production are included in each volume. For practical utility and clarity of presentation, these books are outstanding.

JEAN STARR WIKSELL
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

DISCUSSION AND DEBATE: A TEXTBOOK FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. By William E. Buys, Jack Murphy, and Bruce Kendall. Chicago: National Debate Research Co., 1957; pp. 112. $3.75.

This paperbound manual is designed to develop in the high school student ". . . as quickly and efficiently as possible the skills necessary for effective contest work." Such a purpose should arouse ready sympathy from high school debate coaches.

Although debate technique usurps the major portion of the book, discussion receives a sound presentation as a method of preliminary inquiry. The twelve chapters include an introduction, four chapters on scientific inquiry, one on discussion technique, five on debate, and a final chapter on ethics and behavior in discussion and debate.

Loose leaf inserts follow each chapter. They illustrate, question, or apply the principles of the preceding text to the foreign aid topic. With the assumption that these can be replaced inexpensively each year, they appear to be both practicable and provocative of concentrated study of the national question.

CHARLEY A. LEISTNER
Oberlin College

SO YOU WANT TO PREACH. By Frederick Keller Stamm. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958; pp. 109. $2.00.

Looking upon young ministers of religion as spirits "standing upon the forehead of the age to come," Dr. Stamm has recorded for them some personal thoughts on the broader

aspects of preachers and preaching. Liberal in theological beliefs, pragmatic in educational concepts, and non-classical in rhetorical principles, this famous radio preacher makes his points by reminiscing rather than by contributing fresh insights into the task of religious address. His "letter to a young minister" is, therefore, appropriate for the night-table rather than for the study-desk of one who would learn to preach by sharpening his human tools for service in the communication of God's Word to mankind.

CHARLES A. MCGLON
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

THE KING'S PEACE, 1637-1643. By C. V. Wedgewood. New York: Macmillan, 1956; pp. 510. $6.50.

From the very first page it becomes apparent that C. V. Wedgwood's *The King's Peace* will become, in time, one of the classic works of seventeenth century English history. A first rate addition to the library of any student of public address, *The King's Peace* deals imaginatively and in detail with the career of John Pym, England's first major parliamentary leader. In addition, three chapters of this work are devoted to English parliamentary government in its crucial embryo stage, and there is an especially vivid account of the Strafford impeachment—the "Warren Hastings" trial of the seventeenth century.

Miss Wedgwood combines the highly readable prose style of an Elizabeth Bowen with the meticulous documentation of a Wallace Notestein. One would have to look far indeed before he could find a more stimulating, fascinating, and well-documented historical account than this one.

GOODWIN F. BERQUIST, JR.
The Ohio State University

BOOKS RECEIVED

SELECTED POEMS OF WILLIAM BLAKE. Edited with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes by F. W. Bateson. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. xxxii+144. $2.00.

SELECTED POEMS OF JOHN CLARE. Edited with an Introduction by James Reeves. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. xxxii+143. $1.50.

SELECTED POEMS OF ROBERT BROWNING. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by James Reeves. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. xxxvi+155. $1.75.

SELECTED POEMS OF GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by James Reeves. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. xxviii+103. $1.50.

ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH BALLADS. Edited with an Introduction and Critical Notes by Robert Graves. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. xxviii+163. $2.00.

FENELON'S LETTERS TO MEN AND WOMEN. Edited by Derek Stanford. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957; pp. 208. $4.00.

SAINT AUGUSTINE: THE CITY OF GOD AGAINST THE PAGANS, Vol. I, Books I-III (in seven volumes). With an English translation by George E. McCracken, London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1957; pp. lxxxix +399. $3.00.

WHEN WENDY GREW UP; AN AFTERTHOUGHT. By J. M. Barrie with a foreword by Sydney Blow. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1958; pp. 32. $2.00.

ONE LANGUAGE FOR THE WORLD. By Mario Pei. New York: Devin-Adair, 1958; pp. xvi+291. 5.00.

GOLD MEDAL PLAYS FOR HOLIDAYS: THIRTY ROYALTY-FREE, ONE-ACT PLAYS FOR CHILDREN. By Helen Louise Miller. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1958; pp. vi+432. $4.75.

RADIO PLAYS FROM SHAKESPEARE: TEN PLAYS . . . ADAPTED FOR ROYALTY-FREE PERFORMANCE. By Lewy Olfson. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1958; pp. x+193. $3.75.

VOLPONE, OR THE FOX. By Ben Jonson, edited by Jonas A. Barish. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958; pp. xiv+111. Paper $0.45.

TWELFTH NIGHT, OTHELLO. By William Shakespeare, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Alan S. Downer. New York: Rinehart, 1958; pp. xix+186. Paper $0.50.

AS YOU LIKE IT, JULIUS CAESAR, MACBETH. By William Shakespeare, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Alan S. Downer. New York: Rinehart, 1958; pp. xxiv+242. Paper $0.65.

LANGUAGE IN HISTORY. By Harold Goad. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 246. Paper $0.85.

SELECTED POEMS OF WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Roger Sharrock. New York: Macmillan, 1958, pp. xlviii+141. $1.75.

SELECTED POEMS OF JOHN DONNE. Edited with an Introduction, Notes and Commentary by James Reeves. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. xx+108. $1.50.

GOETHE'S FAUST, PART ONE. Newly translated by Bertram Jessup. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958; pp. 224. $3.75.

PROSE READINGS: IMPRESSIONS AND IDEAS. Edited by William M. Sale, Jr. New York: Rinehart, 1958; pp. xii+367. Paper $1.90.

INQUIRY & EXPRESSION: A COLLEGE READER. By Harold C. Martin and Richard M. Ohmann. New York: Rinehart, 1958; pp. xiv+751. $5.00.

READING FOR UNDERSTANDING. (Revised Edition.) By Maurice B. McNamee, S.J. New York: Rinehart, 1958; pp. xx+552. $4.90.

THE TRAGEDY OF OTHELLO THE MOOR OF VENICE. By William Shakespeare, edited by Gerald Eades Bentley, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 154. Paper $0.65.

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING. By William Shakespeare, edited by Josephine Waters Bennett. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. 126. Paper $0.50.

H. L. MENCKEN: A BIBLIOGRAPHY. By Bernard H. Porter. San Francisco: Bern Porter, 1957; pp. 24. Paper $5.00.

GREAT BIBLE STORIES FOR THE VERSE SPEAKING CHOIR. Edited by Helen A. Brown and Harry J. Heltman. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958; pp. 64. Paper $1.00.

A GRADUATE PROGRAM IN AN UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE: THE SARAH LAWRENCE EXPERIENCE. By members of the Committee on Graduate Studies of Sarah Lawrence College, edited by Charles Trinkaus. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1956; pp. xx+119. $1.50.

THE BACKGROUND OF MODERN POETRY. By J. Isaacs. New York: Dutton, 1958; pp. 116. Paper $0.95.

COLLEGE HANDBOOK OF COMPOSITION. (Sixth Edition.) By Edwin C. Wolley, Franklin W. Scott, and Frederick Bracher. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1958; pp. xviii+474. $3.25.

A TREASURY OF CHRISTMAS PLAYS: ROYALTY-FREE STAGE AND RADIO DRAMAS FOR YOUNG PLAYERS. Edited by Sylvia E. Kamerman. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1958; pp. 509. $5.00.

SIR WILLIAM JOHNSON PAPERS, VOLUME XII. Prepared for publication by Milton W. Hamilton. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1957; pp. viii+1124.

SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

Climbing the Monument

On a Saturday morning following the end of the term in June, ST and family were having a leisurely breakfast in the kitchen. The year of the Sputnik had been a strenuous one, and we were all grateful it was over. Especially grateful we were that the old house still stood, despite the year's activities of the Junior Rockets Society in the basement. The lilacs were at their peak, and the wall of snowballs on the east was about to burst into full bloom. All was quiet and serene. A humble bee, evidently weary of pollinating the raspberries, bumbled through the open window. There were ten days of respite before summer session, and ST had a second cup of coffee on the thought of all the little chores, such as hanging the screens, he would get accomplished.

The serenity was broken by a declaration of the junior member. "Father," he declared, "I have been thinking." At this there were howls from the other three sides of the table: "With what?" "It'll kill you!" "Don't do it!" Unabashed, but mindful that an incomplete phrase is a challenge to hecklers, the eighth grader tried again. "I have been thinking about all the times you have taken us to see parliaments and legislatures, and I must say the experiences were a great help to me this year in my civics class. The one house unicameral session at Lincoln, Nebraska, was something to remember; I especially enjoyed the subway rides in London to see the Mother of Parliaments at work; and the fried perch in the dining room of the old League of Nations in Geneva was the best I ever had." At this point, as though to prove his preparation, he demonstrated a right hand horizontal supine gesture, about figure 14 in Bacon's *Manual of Gesture* (indicating, according to the chart, direct personal address, appeal, challenge, or exhortation), and continued: "But do you realize you have never taken us to our nation's capital, to see our duly elected representatives legislating in the public interest?"

A few days later, the screens still unhung, we were ensconced in one of those reasonable little hotels down by the Pennsylvania Station. Ah, Washington in the spring! Most of the public buildings are air conditioned, various government restaurants offer palatable food reasonably, and one of the greatest shows on earth is before you, free to the people. At night, weary after the day's tramping, you can be lulled to sleep by various visiting high school senior groups singing "Graduation Day" in such variety that the nacht music sounds like a round.

Sooner or later tourists find themselves at the monument, deliberating whether to wait in line for the seventy second trip by elevator, start the climb by foot, or let it go with a snapshot. Since the children insisted on doing it the hard way, ST was delegated to go along to see the darlings did not overexert themselves.

It was delightfully cool in the shaft. By leaning over the rail a bit, and sighting upwards to the light from the windows near the top, we got a purvue of the 555 feet, 5⅛ inches of masonry, the 898 steps, and the 50 landings. ST

carefully pointed out to his wards that the most interesting part of the climb is the bottom stage, where 189 memorial stones are set into the walls. Unmindful of this, the children were off with a whoop. The cries of "Hurry on, dear father," grew fainter and fainter as the children scurried and ST scanned the memorial stones.

The stones, if one properly takes the time to admire them, are something to behold. Most are marble, and in bas-relief—tributes of temperance societies, volunteer fire brigades, Masons, and Sunday schools. At the head of the steps on the landing at 270 feet, there is a stone which excited ST's professional interest. The design is difficult to identify, with what seems to be Roman gladiators, at a podium, with the sun shining on them. Interpretation is made more difficult by the state of disrepair, several of the figures having lost fingers or arms. But clearly carved on the stone is this inscription:

From the Cliosophic Society,
Instituted AD 1765
Nassau Hall, N. J.
TO THE MEMORY OF WASHINGTON

Off and on through later months ST pondered the stone, and finally decided to appeal to his old friend and demon-researcher, Clarence Angell, adviser to the Princeton debaters. Mr. Angell accepted the commission with alacrity. He wrote:

I am enclosing a booklet on the Princeton debating societies, *The Halls—A Brief History of the American Whig-Cliosophic Society of Princeton University* by Wallace J. Williamson, III. There is a longer account in *The American Whig Society* by Jacob N. Beam, which I shall send if you want it. You will note that the "Clubs" were in existence by 1765, although the exact date of founding seems not known. In 1769, the American Whig Society, and in 1770, the Cliosophic society were established.

Using 1765 as the founding date, Clio lays claim to being the oldest student literary, political, and debating society in the whole wide world. (The College Historical Society, Trinity College, Dublin, uses the date 1770, but could lay claim to 1747, the date of Edmund Burke's *The Club*.)

I have read the minutes of the Cliosophic Society from 1849 to 1854, and have found several entries about the ordering and placing of the plaque. None tells what scene is depicted on it. I surmise it is not a Roman scene, and that it is probably a scene in Nassau Hall here showing a session of the Continental Congress, which met in Nassau Hall for several years. I shall send photostats of all pages of the minutes which refer to the marble plaque.

I am going to Washington to look at the stone next week. I may be able to recognize the scene, dilapidated though the sculpturing be, as one in Princeton. I shall take a picture of the stone and bring it back for records here.

One source I have still to consult is the micro-film file of the *Princeton Packet*, a weekly going back that far. There is a rather slim chance that some notice of the sending of the stone might appear there, but since the installation was in Washington D. C., this local paper might not have mentioned it.

The minutes refer to a plaster cast model from which the plaque was sculptured, and that this cast was returned to Princeton and set in the wall above the speaker's chair in old Clio Hall. Some remnants of old Clio hall remain—I was given a paper weight made from the crown of a pillaster saved from the old hall, with an inscription by the present debate teams. I recall seeing other spindles from old Clio Hall in the basement of the present Whig Hall, and—hold your breath—also a yellowed plaster cast about 18 inches long, with figures standing on it. I can't find it now—it, together with the remaining wooden railings and spindles—has been carted away. I have the department of buildings and grounds searching the carpenter shop and warehouse for it. I strongly believe this was the plaster model of the marble plaque, but it may be permanently lost by now. If so, we have missed the boat by a very narrow space of time.

A week later Mr. Angell wrote:

I am glad to be able to report that I have at least found the answer to all of your questions about the marble plaque which the Cliosophic Society contributed for installation in the Washington Monument. I have benefitted from

the help of several persons here at Princeton, notably that of Miss K. Higuchi, the art librarian.

You may be interested in these details, taken from Professor G. Musgrave Giger's *A History of the Cliosophic Society from 1765-1865*. On March 15, 1851, a graduate member of Clio, Frederick S. Giger, wrote to his old society:

"Brethren: My attention was directed last week to the following report in the Baltimore Sun: 'We yesterday saw, at the marble works of Mr. Baugham, an elegant block of Carrara marble, two feet wide, four feet long, and fifteen inches thick, which is being fashioned for a place in the National Monument. In the center of the face of the block are the words, "Amer. Whig Soc. Princeton College, New Jersey. A memento to Washington." On either side of this a star, a facsimile of the medal issued by the Association.' This stone I went to see, and ascertained that it would be finished in a week. Having heard that our Hall intended to make a similar contribution to the National Monument, I felt desirous that, as the Whig Society had stolen a march upon us in point of *time*, we should, if possible, surpass them in the style and value of the gift. Prompted by this feeling, and the strong interest in the Hall which I have long cherished, and which is now as great as when an actor in its scenes, and an enthusiastic participant in its deliberations, I overcame my reluctance to make any communication upon the subject, and determined to risk the imputation of presumption in sending the enclosed design, with the hope that if it should not suit your taste the information accompanying it may prove useful and acceptable.

The drawing is, as you will perceive, only a hasty sketch; the design requires little if any explanation. The group in the foreground is taken from the Hall diploma. The two members may typify the North and the South joining hands over the altar of friendship, for *we* know *no* sections—we are brothers. Our Muse is directing their attention to the bust of Washington, placed on the top of an obelisk, as a fit model, and elevated upon the loftiest pinnacle of human ambition, inspiring them with emulation to aim for the highest distinction through the greatest efforts for the public good. The star of our Muse is shining clearly and brightly upon them. She herself is floating upon the cloud of incense encircling the obelisk, the grateful offering of our hearts.

. . . If the work is done in Baltimore, I would esteem it a privilege to be permitted to carry out the wishes of the Society, and to give all the information and attention necessary to the completion and delivery of the same."

The plan and design were accepted by the club, and Mr. Giger was commissioned to see the job executed. From the description of the design, you can see why we had trouble identifying it, and why you couldn't find anything in Bullfinch's *Age of Fable* to correspond. The stone was finished on June 8, 1853, and shipped to Washington. On June 14, sponsor Giger wrote to Elisha Whittlesey, general agent of the Washington National Monument Association, explaining the nature of the stone and formally presenting it. The letter of presentation was published in many of the newspapers of the time.

Asked about recent history of the clubs, Mr. Angell explained that the Whig and the Cliosophic merged in 1928. They still occupy one of the marble halls, cornerstones of which were laid in 1890. The Society's Debate Panel arranges intercollegiate debates, a Senate carries on extemporaneous debates in the fashion of the U. S. Senate, an International Relations Club concentrates on foreign affairs. The society sponsors an annual colloquium of distinguished speakers, including Senators, justices, and an occasional governor.

The last we heard from Mr. Angell he was planning another trip to Washington to see if he could discover the Whig stone, which set off the whole matter. He missed it the last trip, he said. Anyone for climbing the Washington Monument?

OUR PERIPATETIC STAFF. Donald C. Bryant, Editor of QJS, left Washington University, St. Louis, this summer, taking with him the Journal, the files, back issues—in fact everything thereunto appertaining except Penny Brown, the secre-

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

National

Speech Association of America: Hilton, Chicago, December 29-31; (1959: Statler, Washington, December 28-30; 1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30).

American Educational Theatre Association: with SAA in Chicago; (1959: with SAA in Washington; 1960: with Children's Theatre Conference in Denver, August; 1961: with CTC in New York, August).

American Forensic Association: with SAA in Chicago.

American Speech and Hearing Association: New Yorker, New York, November 17-19.

The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation, National University Extension Association: with SAA in Chicago.

National Society for the Study of Communication: with SAA in Chicago.

Regional

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 9-11. (Golden anniversary convention.)

Southern States: Sheraton-Seelbach, Louisville, April 6-10.

Central States: Statler, Detroit, April 10-11.

Western States: Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, November 27-29.

Pacific Speech Ass'n.: U. of Hawaii, Honolulu, November 21-22.

Related Organizations

American Association for Cleft Palate Rehabilitation: Sheraton, Philadelphia, April 30, May 1-2.

Modern Language Association: New York, December 27-29.

National Council of Teachers of English: Penn-Sheraton, Pittsburgh, November 27-29.

National Society for Crippled Children and Adults: Statler-Hilton, Dallas, November 16-20.

tary. Mr. Bryant was at Washington twenty-one years. When he left he was chairman of the division of speech and chairman of the department of English. He is now at the University of Iowa as professor of rhetoric with no administrative duties. This fall he will teach the course in classical rhetoric and give a seminar on Edmund Burke. Across the river in the theatre at Iowa will be James H. Clancy, who left San Jose State College in California this fall, and as editor took with him the *Educational Theatre Journal.*

Robert Gunderson, editor of "New Books in Review," has left Oberlin College for Indiana University, where he is professor of speech and drama. Editor Gunderson had been at Oberlin twenty years. This summer he taught at the University of Michigan. He reports that at one time in July he had a house each in Oberlin, in Ann Arbor, and in Bloomington. His new position brings reunion with an old colleague at Oberlin, J. Jeffery Auer, who went from Oberlin to Virginia in 1947. Mr. Auer, as previously announced in this column, became head of the department at Indiana this summer.

C. K. Thomas, associate editor (Phonetics), has left Cornell University after thirty-five years of service there. From 1922-1958, except for one year at the University of Pittsburgh, 1926-27, he was on the faculty at Ithaca. From 1926 to 1958 he was in charge of the speech clinic. This fall he became Professor of Speech and Director of the English Language Institute for Foreign Students, University of Florida, Gainesville. He will work in the Institute and teach phonetics in the department.

INVITATION

Shop Talk solicits your news and comments. Because of the increased postal rates we shall not be able to make many calls for items. You might keep these deadlines in mind:

December number: .....October 15
February number: ....December 15
April number: .....February 15
October number: .....August 15

Please write to Richard Murphy, 204 A Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana.

OUR SUBSCRIBERS. The SAA *Directory*—the 1958 edition was issued in March—tells many things about the members, and contains some interesting entries. There used to be a name listed that was identified as being founder, president, and treasurer of his college, and a full professor in four departments. He also had a list of degrees, 12 in the 1956 directory. We asked Executive Secretary Owen Peterson to report such matters of interest he might turn up in scanning the list this year.

He reports we have readers (subscribers, at

least) in these foreign countries: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, England, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, and USSR.

Copies addressed to members with some institutional attachment go to such places as the California State Prison, the Minnesota Braille School, the Indian Embassy in Washington, D. C., and the Illinois Hatchery.

Among distinguished subscribers are Mr. H. J. Price of Toronto, Member of Parliament, and Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago.

Only two members are listed from Alaska. One is Mrs. Krantz, who has a report in this issue. Alaska, by the way, is given in the geographical index after Wyoming, in place forty-nine. Next directory should see it in place two, just after Alabama.

The directory runs to pp. 468, and is a mine of information. It can be procured from the Executive Secretary for $2.00 postpaid.

CALL TO CONVENTION

The 43rd annual SAA convention will be held in Chicago, December 29-31, at the Hilton. All the organizations which meet usually or periodically with SAA this year also will be in convention (see calendar). In addition to the organizations having full programs, a number of special organizational meetings will be held: Central States Speech Association Advisory Council; Delta Sigma Rho Executive Council; National Collegiate Players business meeting; Phi Beta luncheon meeting; Pi Kappa Delta general meeting; Tau Kappa Alpha council meeting.

Program planner John E. Dietrich, first vice-president, had copy completed for checking by mid-August. An added feature of the convention is the beginning date—four days after Christmas; even the most distant delegate should not have his Christmas day disrupted.

Conventions

The 49th annual convention of the Speech Association of the Eastern States was held April 17-19, at the Sheraton-McAlpin in New York. Officers elected are: Magdalene Kramer, President, Teachers College, Columbia University; Paul D. Holtzman, First Vice-President, Pennsylvania State University; Harold M. Scholl, Second Vice-President, Montclair State College; Wiley C. Bowyer, Executive Secretary, Mineola Public Schools; Robert T. Oliver, Editor of Publication, Pennsylvania State University.

Secretary Bowyer reports the following resolution was passed: (1) Mindful of the general concern about education in this Atomic Age, the association reaffirms its belief that in the United States every child is entitled to free education in public elementary and secondary schools up to the limit of his capacity. (2) A sound curriculum should provide continuous education in the basic communication skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing—and in the disciplines of social studies, science and foreign languages. (3) The association believes that schools should regularly offer opportunities for the development of individual talents and interest in art, music, theatre and other fine arts, so that the young people of the United States may be fully prepared to meet the challenge of other and alien cultures, and to take proper pride in their American heritage. (4) Colleges and universities should continue to emphasize the importance of mathematics and science, but not at the sacrifice of full programs of liberal arts and professional training.

Plans for the fiftieth annual convention in 1959 (see calendar) were announced. (SAES is the oldest professional speech organization in the country.) In addition to the regular program, to be planned by Mr. Bowyer, there will be special anniversary programs as follows: Carroll C. Arnold, Cornell University, 50 Years of Rhetoric; John Gassner, Yale University, 50 Years of Theatre; Robert West, Brooklyn College, 50 Years of Speech Sciences; Ray Irwin, Syracuse University, 50 Years of Interpretation; Evelyn Konigsberg, Washington Irving High School, 50 Years of Speech Education; sponsors to be announced, 50 Years of Radio and TV.

The Western Speech Association convention will be held in Salt Lake City, during the Thanksgiving holiday (see calendar). Johnnye Akin, 1st vice-president in charge of the program, announces there will be conducted tours of Temple Square, and an organ recital in the Tabernacle. Short courses in speech and hearing will be given by Jon Eisenson, president of ASHA, Ollie L. Backus, and Adam J. Sortini. Henk Huizing of Holland will not be able to attend; his paper on acoupedics will be read, however. There will be six sectional meetings in theatre. Joseph Smith, University of Hawaii,

will return to Salt Lake to give one of the reading hours. Mass media and public address are assigned six sections, and there will be four sections in secondary fields.

The convention of the Southern Speech Association is reported by Paul Brandes, Mississippi Southern College, retiring secretary:

The 28th Annual Convention of the Southern Speech Association was held at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Texas, March 31-April 4. President Tom Lewis of Florida State University presided.

Highlights of the program consisted of a series of papers in rhetoric in memory of Dallas Dickey, a special association luncheon honoring Claude M. Wise, and an address by J. J. Auer entitled, "Speech and the Satellite," delivered at the first joint session.

Next year's convention will be held in Louisville, Kentucky, during the first week in April. Officers for the new year are H. Hardy Perritt, President; M. L. Gehring, Executive Secretary; First Vice-President and program chairman, McDonald W. Held of Howard Payne College.

Central States met at Christmas last year. The convention was reported in the April issue.

AAUP AND SAA. On April 25, 26 at the Cosmopolitan Hotel in Denver the American Association of University Professors held its forty-fourth annual meeting. Bower Aly was there as a delegate from Oregon; Charlotte Wells represented Missouri; Francis E. X. Dance represented the Chicago Area Council. Thorrel Fest of Colorado served as official parliamentarian the first day, and his colleague Victor Harnack, the second.

The Conference of the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers was held in Brussels, Belgium, September 1-6. Robert P. Newman, president of the University of Pittsburgh Chapter, was a delegate. Another Pitt man, William S. Tacey, has been elected president of the Pennsylvania Division, AAUP.

COUNCIL ON CO-OPERATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION. About two years ago SAA became a member of the Council on Co-operation in Teacher Education. At the annual meeting of CCTE in November 1957, SAA was represented by its executive vice-president Kenneth Hance and by Karl R. Wallace. The meeting addressed itself to this question: What are desirable qualities for the certification of teachers? At the end of the two-day meeting, the conference reached agreement on some ten policies which after further study and refinement may be recommended to national and state offices of education. Among other things, CCTE warned against too narrow an interpretation of the certification process. Certification should at least include standards by which teachers are judged, the encouragement and approval of teacher education programs, accreditation of the institutions which prepare student teachers, the selection, assignment, and approval of teachers by the teacher education institutions. It was recognized that although certification processes must be centralized and administered through the state department of education or a comparable agency, policies should be established co-operatively through active and positive participation of school boards, teacher education institutions, teachers-in-service, school administrators, and representatives from the subject-matter disciplines. The conference also went on record as believing that teacher preparation should be regarded as a five-year process, although the customary four-year program is now more realistic and practicable. It was recognized, too, that the states should be encouraged to reexamine their certification requirements in the interests of eliminating practices which are irrelevant to teaching and to professional competence. Furthermore, it was held highly desirable that certification should be regarded as something more than a stamp of approval at the beginning of a teacher's career; it should also include periodic evaluations of the teacher in service, with recertification. Finally, the conference clearly recognized that the teacher preparation institution must bear the primary responsibility for certifying to the competencies of the candidate (1) at specialized educational levels and in specialized curricular and service areas, (2) in general education, (3) in professional education, and (4) in personal characteristics essential to successful teaching. As a comment on (1) it is worth observing that the conference held that in the secondary grades, adequate preparation for teaching in one or more subject fields should be attested to by the appropriate department representative, and where certificates for comprehensive teachers are granted, preparation should be sufficient to provide a realistic background for teaching and a solid basis of subject matter should be required in one of

the combined areas—sufficient preparation at least to permit teaching in upper division courses and to allow further graduate work in the field.

In general it may be said that the conference represented a straightforward attempt to recognize the legitimate and appropriate roles of both the professional educators and the state's ultimate responsibility for education on the one hand, and of the teachers of subject matter fields on the other.

KARL R. WALLACE
University of Illinois

VISIT TO THE PRINTER. Through the kindness of the Missouri State High School Speech Conference, we spent three delightful early May days in Columbia. Among the many pleasant spots to visit in that very pleasant place, is Artcraft Press, 10 Watson Place, on the edge of the campus. There the QJS printer, Nelson Heath Meriwether, applies his artistry to various speech publications, a sort of specialty and hobby with him. We dropped in to pay our respects and were cordially received. Among speech journals and works, in addition to *QJS*, Artcraft prints *Educational Theatre Journal*, *The Speech Teacher*, *Speech Monographs*, the annual *Discussion and Debate Manual*, two volumes, and the SAA *Directory*. The publications are also mailed by the printer.

The press has a staff of thirty-five, with twenty-seven of them in the shop, and is union. In fact three unions are involved: Typographers, Binders, and Pressmen.

We have never failed, on a visit, to find some interesting work about to be given to the world. This time, rolling off the bindery was *James Albert Winans, 1872-1956*, the addresses of the commemorative meeting held at the Boston convention, thirty-two pages. The edition was privately printed, and was arranged by H. A. Wichelns of Cornell University.

NEWS FROM THE FORTY-NINTH. Curious about what may be happening in a territory about to become a state, we wrote to Mrs. Henrietta Krantz. Mrs. Krantz, it may be remembered, received the unofficial citation at the Boston convention for being the delegate to travel the greatest distance. For some years she commuted between Alaska and Hawaii, arranging her schedule, we hope, to take advantage of the best available seasons. She works out of Juneau, but is now stationed at Ketchikan, on the southeastern tip of Alaska. Address: box 1498. Mrs. Krantz thanks us for our "welcome to the union" greeting and adds: "My hope has always been that both Hawaii and Alaska would be states in my lifetime but I really never expected to see even one of them make it. There are exciting years ahead of us." Here is her report.

VOLUNTEERS ASSIST IN THE SPEECH PROGRAM IN ALASKA

Without the help of volunteer workers and teachers, Alaska's new little Speech and Hearing Program, organized by the Alaska Department of Health with the sponsorship of the Alaska Crippled Children's Association, would have been grounded early in its career. Speech and hearing therapists are at a premium in our new 49th state that comprises a territory equal to one fifth the size of the whole United States, an area over twice the size of Texas. Because of climatic and other reasons, problems of middle ear infections are sometimes the rule rather than the exception. There are only half a dozen trained individuals to cover all the needs of children with problems of speech and hearing. Completing the roster are two or three therapists in the Anchorage School System, with another at the Alaska Crippled Children's Association Treatment Center and, in Southeast Alaska, the Alaska Department of Health consultant heading the program with a therapist each in Juneau and Ketchikan.

One of the first jobs of the speech and hearing consultant was to train interested teachers and willing volunteers to carry on a program while she hopped on tiny coastal planes from one to another of the three communities in the original program, Juneau, Ketchikan, and Sitka. These volunteer assistants, trained in workshops, do sweep check testing in the screening program for hearing, thus giving annual hearing tests to all 8, 11, and 14 year olds. They help the therapist by following through on some of the routine practice, so necessary in a speech correction program, and setting up guilds to plan and prepare materials to be used, not only in the small therapy groups, but by classroom teachers as they supplement the therapist's job. Girl and Boy Scout Troops choose, as projects, the manufacture of speech games to be used at a review of history, geography, and arithmetic facts.

One factor handicapping the volunteer program is the number of working mothers, necessitated by the high cost of living in Alaska. Interest and enthusiasm, unfortunately, cannot

put more hours into the work day, and baby sitters are at a premium. Some of these mothers have solved the problem by doubling up on baby sitting jobs, thus relieving one or two of their number to play speech games with, perhaps, a little deaf boy in the orthopedic hospital at Mt. Edgecumbe, or a cerebral palsied child whose mother is hoping to enter him in a Ketchikan kindergarten in the fall, or with a deaf girl who, because of health reasons, has not been able to go outside for an education. An overworked teacher in Haines has used her own time to give a hard-of-hearing boy speech reading lessons, and so has made it possible for him to keep up with his class. The tape recorder and taped comments from the consultant have managed a program of speech improvement that has helped him to adjust socially.

Realizing the importance of teachers who are able to recognize problems within their classroom and assume responsibility for most of the follow-up of procedures initiated by the therapist, emphasis has been placed on the in-service training program offered for teachers through the University of Alaska. Courses termed "Speech in the Classroom" have been given through the Community College at Ketchikan, through the Juneau Community College, and at the Sheldon Jackson Summer Session in conjunction with Whitworth College, Spokane, Washington. The practice teaching, a partial requirement of the course, serves several functions. The teacher becomes enthusiastic over first hand knowledge of what can be accomplished, parents who are frequent observers of speech lessons become interested and are potential volunteer assistants, while the children grow in their enthusiasm over a program that is set up with a speech fun approach.

A program set up in January 1956, solely to discover if there were speech and hearing needs, found itself, by June 1958, swamped with an annual case load of approximately 2,861 children and 230 adults. Many of the cases were located through a special survey. The month of June, Better Hearing Month as designated by the American Hearing Society, was observed in southeast Alaska by a program of hearing testing for adults made available for the first time in five of the larger communities. Major work of testing was carried on by members of the volunteer groups who had been trained to do threshold testing. For the most part, people who came for the tests had hearing losses and felt a need for help in their problems. The number of persons tested is shown in the table below.

Area	Population	Volunteers	Threshold Tests	Sweep Check Tests	Speech Perception
Juneau-Douglas	6655	6	60	2	3
Ketchikan	5305	6	40	0	3
Petersburg	1619	3	10	0	0
Mt. Edgecumbe	147	8	19	0	0
Sitka	1985	8	49	2	8
Total		31	178	4	14

HENRIETTA C. KRANTZ,
Speech Consultant,
Alaska Department of Health, Juneau

THEATRE AND CINEMA

Purdue University's new Loeb Playhouse presented its first production, Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra*, on May 9, 1958. Most of the theatre's cost was underwritten by Bert and June E. Loeb of Lafayette, Indiana. The Playhouse is only one part of a massive building known as the Purdue Memorial Union—Hall of Music Annex. The Loeb Playhouse seats 1050 persons, 600 on the main floor and 450 in the balcony. The stage, flanked with small stages on each side, is 110 feet wide, 44 feet deep, and 68 feet high and has a hydraulic lift 35 feet long by 10 feet wide. Stage lighting is controlled by a ten-scene pre-set board located in the back of the auditorium. In addition, there is a stage manager's panel, containing a full set of lighting controls, in the right wing of the stage. Facilities for music and sound effects include four independent systems, one of which uses the newest developments in stereophonic amplification. The stage is equipped with two main curtains, one, a traveller, opening on the sides, and the other, a guillotine, dropping into place from above. In the sub-basement beneath the auditorium is the Experimental Theatre, seating 160 people. On the same level below the stage are also six rehearsal rooms, property storage rooms, a wardrobe area, storage facil-

ities for 4,000 costumes, a dyeing room, and a makeup storage room. On the same level behind the stage is a paint shop 33 feet wide, 96 feet long, and 26 feet high. Below the paint shop and of the same size is the carpentry shop. All the workshops and theatres are completely air conditioned.

Two touring companies are in the news for performances abroad. The University of Delaware last spring presented *The Tender Trap* in an eight week tour of Defense Bases in the Pacific. For this the University is receiving a citation from the Defense Department. Last summer the Yale Drama School players represented this country at the International Festival of University Theatres in Brussels. They presented Archibald MacLeish's verse drama, *J. B.*, which had its world premiere at the Yale Drama School last April. The Yale thespians also toured United States Army bases in France and Germany, giving performances of *Out of the Frying Pan* by Francis Swann.

The second conference of the Eastern States Theatre Association will be held at the University of Delaware on November 21, 22. Principal speaker will be John Wray Young, vice-president of AETA.

The University of Southern California now has a program for a Ph.D. in cinema. During 1957-58, the cinema department produced 58 motion pictures, 42 by student crews. A newly formed Graduate Production Unit has completed one of a series of films called "On Seeing Film." It is designed to guide high-school students in a more critical appreciation of motion pictures.

The Flying Angel, a color short subject produced by Unusual Films of Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, was selected as a United States entry in the 1958 Edinburgh, Scotland, Film Festival held in August and September. *The Flying Angel* and a feature length Bob Jones University production, *Wine of Morning*, represented the product of American universities and colleges at the Cannes Film Festival and the Paris Conference of the International Congress of Motion-Picture and Television School Directors during the month of May.

We asked Barnard Hewitt, commissioned by the American Educational Theatre Association to serve as United States delegate to the international theatre festival in Brussels this summer, to report what he saw there. Here is his report.

FITU in Brussels

Although theatre has no place in the curriculum of the universities of Europe and student theatre activity is without benefit of faculty direction, university theatre flourishes, if one may judge by the Festival International de Théâtre Universitaire (FITU) which was held at the International Exposition in Brussels August 2-9.

Ten companies from nine countries presented plays in seven languages. The United States was represented by a company from the Yale School of Drama performing Archibald McLeisch's new verse play *J.B.* under the direction of Curtis Canfield.

I did not see *J.B.*, for I was able to be present for only three of the eight Festival days. However, I saw the Experimental Theatre of the Students of Zagreb perform two farce comedies by Marin Drzic (1508-1565), the New Theatre of the J. W. Goethe University, Frankfort-am-Main, perform Bertolt Brecht's version of Sophocles' *Antigone*, and the Gençlik Theatre of Istanbul perform *The Circles* by the contemporary Turkish playwright, Cetin Altan.

Of these the Jugo-Slav performance was the most enjoyable, partly because Drzic's plays lend themselves to broad pantomime and colorful costume, but mainly because the troupe played with tremendous verve and unusual comic inventiveness. Brecht's play, which is a study of dictatorship rather than a conflict of codes, and much more Creon's play than Antigone's, was more successful in the group effects than in the acting of the major roles. The Turkish group, handicapped by having to perform in improvised scenery and costumes because their own had failed to arrive, did not succeed in making Altan's modern problem play effective.

Before I arrived a Brussels group had been seen in Aristophanes' *The Birds*, a group from the Sorbonne in Paris in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*, and a group from Cardiff, Wales, in Christopher Fry's *A Sleep of Prisoners*. After I left, performances were scheduled of Vincente's *Trilogy of the Boats* by a group from Coimbra, Portugal; Ghelderode's *Pantagleize* by a group from Leuven, Belgium; and *La Commedia degli Zanni* by a group from Venice.

One of the hazards of international festivals

is the undependability of freight transportation. The scenery for the Turkish play was unaccountably delayed in Munich. Scenery, costumes and properties for *J.B.*, although supposedly shipped from the United States a month before, had not arrived. Moreover, no one knew where they were; they had disappeared without a trace. Canfield was reconciled to performing for the Festival without them, the more readily because the stage was too low to accommodate most of the scenery, but he was beginning to worry for fear they might not be found in time for the second performance, scheduled three weeks later in the main Exposition theatre.

The Festival performances took place in a theatre in the Belgian Arts building, which has a handsome and comfortable modern auditorium seating about 700 people and a stage of adequate width and depth and lighting facilities but with little height and no provisions for hanging scenery. In the three productions I saw, skeletal forms and furniture were used to provide simple but effective settings.

The auditorium was well filled with an interested audience for each of the performances I witnessed. Guest of honor on each occasion was the ambassador of the country whose students were performing.

Language, of course, was a problem. As for the United Nations, programs and official announcements were in French and English. Business meetings of the sponsoring organization, the European Student Theatre Union (ESTU), were carried on in French, English, and German. I attended one which was devoted to revision of its constitution and I admired and envied the officers, who understood if they did not speak all three languages and who managed to keep things moving almost as fast as similar business in a meeting of SAA or AETA. Other sessions of ESTU were devoted to means of strengthening the organization and to plans for the next Festival, which will be held next summer at Bristol University, if Bristol can obtain a little more money for the expenses.

Although FITU was sponsored by ESTU, arrangements and administration were the responsibility of a committee of the Student Theatre of the Free University of Brussels, headed by Gerard Descotils, a young man who is not a teacher but an economist and banker. He had solved the problem of housing and feeding over a hundred participants and guests by establishing FITU headquarters in Pavillon 58, a youth hostel just outside the Exposition grounds close to the theatre. There everybody slept on cots or bunks in rough wooden cabins, bathed in a communal bathouse, and ate in a messhall with rough wooden tables and benches and a juke box, which was usually emitting American jazz or hillbilly music. I have not experienced anything remotely like dinner at Pavillon 58 since I was a counsellor in a boys' camp thirty years ago—and there was no juke box in the boys' camp.

M. Descotils realized that Pavillon 58, though quite adequate and even enjoyable for the young, might be a little rugged for Mrs. Hewitt and me, and he secured for us what he called a *veritable* room in a private house nearby. There we found our own special language problem, for our hosts spoke largely Flemish and the small French on both sides was less than adequate. With good will and gestures we managed minimal communication.

Everyone seemed much pleased that the United States was represented in the Festival by the Yale play and the AETA delegate and expressed hope that the liaison with America will grow and strengthen.

BARNARD HEWITT
University of Illinois

FORENSICS

The newly formed Maryland-Washington Forensic Conference, consisting of ten schools in the Washington area, took full advantage of its location in the Nation's capital to give color to its first Capitol Hill Debate Tournament last March. A luncheon was held in the Senate Caucus Room; Senators Mundt, Goldwater, and Erwin as well as several Congressmen were among the judges. Vice-President Richard Nixon spoke on his experiences as a debater, and Robert F. Kennedy, Chief Counsel of the McClellan Committee, discussed some of the Committee findings. Final events took place in the Capitol Building. Thirty-four colleges participated. February 20, 21 have been selected as dates for the 1959 Capitol Hill Tournament. Malthon M. Anapol, University of Maryland, is president of the conference.

Robert Haakenson reports that the University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch, has joined the Great Northern Debate League (see XLIV, 222 for story on the league). Among the exchanges, the University of Manitoba debaters will appear for a convocation program in Duluth.

Wayne N. Thompson, Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois, has set

November 15 as the deadline for declaration of entry in the Eighth Annual National Contest in Public Discussion. Contestants compete by tape recordings.

The University of Pittsburgh reports that the Women's Debating Association has now merged with the Men's Debating Association, to form the William Pitt Debating Union, directed by Robert N. Newman and Mary Margaret Roberts. The Women's Association was organized in 1921. Some of the past directors known to *QJS* readers are: Wayland Maxfield Parrish, H. A. Wichelns, Marie Hochmuth, Ruth R. Hahn, Theresa Kahn Murphy, and Raymond F. Howes, later secretary of Cornell University, and now staff associate, American Council on Education. Also past directors of the women are Louis Broido, now president of Gimbel's, New York, and Genevieve Blatt, now Secretary of Internal Affairs, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

THE COLLEGE QUESTIONS. The national debate proposition is "Resolved: That the further development of nuclear weapons should be prohibited by international agreement." The discussion question is: "How can we improve our relations with Latin America?" The announcement was made in August by T. Earle Johnson, chairman of the SAA committee on intercollegiate discussion and debate. The chairman this year, in the rotating arrangement, represented Tau Kappa Alpha. Other members are: Orville Hitchcock (Delta Sigma Rho), Glenn L. Jones (Phi Rho Pi), Harvey Cromwell (Pi Kappa Delta), Austin J. Freely (American Forensic Association), and Winston Brembeck (SAA).

AFA will sponsor an intercollegiate debate on the subject at the Chicago convention in December, between Northwestern and Notre Dame. An open meeting of the committee will be held at the convention.

THE HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONS were reported in detail in the April issue (pp. 221-222). They concern American education and comparisons with systems abroad. The 32nd *Discussion and Debate Manual*, on *American Education*, two volumes, is now available. The Committee on Debate and Discussion Materials will have an open meeting at the Chicago convention. For details of materials, copies of the annual broadcast debate, and convention program, write to Bower Aly, executive secretary of the committee, 209 Villard Hall, University of Oregon, Eugene.

OXFORD DEBATERS HERE. This fall and winter two representatives of the Oxford Union Society will tour the East, dip into Canada, and explore the Midwest and South. As usual, they are a bit beyond the usual American intercollegiate debater in age and experience. Mr. Stuart T. Griffiths, of Magdalen College, is twenty-four, and reading law. He has served as 2nd lieutenant in the Royal Artillery with the British Army of the Rhine. He is editor of the *Conservative Association Magazine*. Balancing him in opinion is Brian Alastair Walden, twenty-six, Queen's College, chairman of the student committee of the Socialist International. He has served as pilot officer in the Royal Air Force. Both are native Englishmen; Mr. Griffiths was born in Evesham, Worcestershire, and Mr. Walden in West Bromwich, Staffordshire. Both are past presidents of the Union.

Their itinerary, necessarily tentative as we go to press, is given with the thought that debate coaches, debaters, and others may wish to hear a debate in their district when the Oxonians arrive. Better write to the nearest college to confirm. Inquiries about engagements should be addressed to Miss Judith Sayers, Head, United Kingdom and Northern European Division, European Department, Institute of International Education, 1 East 67th Street at Fifth Avenue, New York 21.

Here is the itinerary:

October 2, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia; 3, Yale University; 4, English-Speaking Union, New York City; 6, Fordham College; 7, College of New Rochelle; 9, Bates College; 10, McGill University, Montreal; 13, Hamilton College; 15, Cornell University; 17, King's College, Wilkes-Barre; 20, Bucknell University; 21, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh; 22, Grove City College; 23, University of Pittsburgh; 25, Oberlin College; 27, Kent State University; 28, Denison University; 29, Ohio State University; 30, Michigan State University; 31, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Illinois; November 3, Northwestern University; 4, University of Illinois; 5, Wabash College; 6, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie; 7, Indiana University; 10, De Pauw University; 11, University of Kentucky; 12, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute; 14, University of the South, Sewanee; 17, University of Alabama; 18, Florida State University; 19, University of Florida; 23, University of Miami; 24, University of South Carolina; December 1, University of Richmond; 2, Hampton Institute; 3, University of Maryland; 4, Temple University; 5, Princeton University; 8, Williams

College; 9, Trinity College, Hartford; 10, Aft: Brooklyn College, Eve: Columbia University; 11, United States Merchant Marine Academy, King's Point, Long Island; 13, debaters depart for United Kingdom.

The questions for debate proposed are:

(1) That the function of the cinema and theatre is to entertain rather than to instruct. (2) That the United States of America should so orient her foreign policy as to diminish her interest in, and reliance upon Europe. (3) That capital punishment should be abolished. (4) That since 1945 the Western World has failed to oppose Communism effectively. (5) That an extension of the Socialist concept of equality can only be at the expense of the rights of the individual. (6) That in modern Western civilization there is no longer any appreciation of the excellent. (7) That the West should adopt the Russian system of education.

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATES, 1958. This is the centennial year of the famous debates between the Great Emancipator and the Little Giant. All the towns in Illinois where debates were held are having pageants and reenactments of the proceedings. In general, festivities are scheduled for a date to correspond to the original, although Ottawa, the first, got off to a head start on August 21, three days before the 24th date of 1858. The last affair will be at Alton, October 15. The participants and some members in the audience appear in costume of the past day. The original three hour text is usually cut down to fifteen-to-twenty minutes.

Feeling we ought to do something to pay our respects to the debates, we started off with a preliminary affair at the town of Bement, in east-central Illinois, population 1,459. Why we started there is a story in itself. Let us turn back a century in time, as the reenactors say. In the 1858 campaign for Senator from Illinois, Lincoln and Douglas stumped the state. Douglas accused Lincoln of following him around to make use of his crowds. Douglas, it should be remembered, was the great man of the day, Lincoln the unknown. On July 24, Lincoln sent a short note by meessenger to Douglas, then in Chicago, asking if it "would be agreeable . . . to make an arrangement for you and myself to divide time, and address the same audiences the present canvass?" Douglas wrote a long reply the same day, expressing surprise that Lincoln had "waited until after I had made my appointments." He agreed, however, to a debate in each of the seven congressional districts, and named the places. "I will confer with you at the earliest convenient opportunity," he wrote, concerning "mode of conducting the debate, the times of meeting at the several places," and other matters. The convenient time for conference came on July 29 on what is now highway 105. Douglas was returning to Bement from addressing a meeting in Monticello, and Lincoln was on his way to Monticello to speak. Supposedly Douglas was in a surrey and Lincoln was riding in a spring wagon. At a spot now marked by a cement pyramid, the vehicles stopped, and Lincoln walked over to talk to Douglas. It was agreed that Lincoln would stop at Bement that night, where he would get a midnight Wabash train for Springfield. In Bement, Douglas was staying at the home of Francis E. Bryant, merchant and banker, cousin of William Cullen Bryant. Lincoln returned to Bement, discussed arrangements that night, and the following morning Douglas wrote him a letter specifying the details of the debates. That was the beginning.

The house where Lincoln and Douglas met is now maintained by the State of Illinois as a memorial. It is a delightful place, in spacious grounds, and is known officially as *Bement Cottage*, open eight to five daily, no admittance charge. Mindful of its importance in history, the town of Bement holds various ceremonials from time to time. On the evening of July 4, this year, the meeting of Lincoln and Douglas was reenacted, spring wagon, surrey, and all, in the town grove. Against a series of backdrops, actors pantomimed events of the meeting, while a narrator supplied background. Afterwards there were fireworks and a concert by the high-school band. The centennial had begun officially.

THE LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL. When one lives in what the state of Illinois emblazons on its license plates as "The Land of Lincoln," odds and ends of Lincolnia persistently turn up. Someone will be entertaining you in his back yard, and will show you the maple tree Lincoln once tied his horse to. The other day we saw a clock "which Lincoln much admired." The reasoning was this. The clock originally was in a house Lincoln is said to have visited. It is a big grandfather's clock, and hence would be noticed by anyone who entered the house. It is also a very handsome piece, the sort of thing Mr. Lincoln would have admired, had he seen it. Hence: a clock once admired by Lincoln. But to the point. We were clipping away at

the front lawn one pleasantly warm day in late August when our old friends Fred and Retta Baringer, who live just around the corner, strolled by. We fell to talking about the celebration of their fiftieth wedding anniversary on the coming Sunday afternoon, and when would be the most likely time to turn up before the punch got too diluted. As they strolled off, they remarked, "You know the boy is coming in for the occasion. Why don't you stop around Sunday morning for a visit?"

So, on Sunday morning we strolled down the lane, opened the garden gate, and met the son. He is William E. Baringer, professor of history at the University of Florida, distinguished Lincoln scholar now on leave to be Executive Director of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission in Washington. Although we were aware that something was afoot, we weren't too clear about the details. The Executive Director reviewed the situation. The actual sesquicentennial of Lincoln's birth will not occur until February 12, 1959. Looking ahead, however, in 1957 Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing a commission. The President signed the measure on September 2 of that year. The commission consists of the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House as *ex officio* members. In addition, six members were appointed by the President of the Senate, six by the Speaker of the House, and twelve by the President. One statutory member, the Director of the National Park Service, completes the roster. Work of the commission is expected to run until March 1, 1960. Appropriately enough, a Senator from Lincoln's birthstate, Kentucky, the Honorable John Sherman Cooper, is Chairman.

We asked the director about all those stories that the commission was already in the hole, and took from our wallet a clipping of an AP dispatch of July 17 which read, "Board Set Up to Spend $10,000 Has Used $15,713 on Its Offices." All very simple, explained Professor Baringer; the newsman didn't read Public Law 85-262, 85th Congress, H. J. Res. 351, 71 Stat. 587, Sec. 8, which clearly states, "an appropriation of not to exceed $10,000 to prepare the *preliminary report and plans* of the Commission." The reporters got the expenses for offices correct, but the whole affair may run something over a million. Main item of expense will be a Lincoln bibliography, budgeted at around a hundred thousand. The Commission is ensconced in the National Archives Building with six telephones, four numbers, and a working staff of eight. Later on exhibits will be displayed, but at the moment not much but business is being transacted. You are welcome to drop in and look around, however.

A *Handbook of Information*, with various hints on Lincoln celebrations and commemorations, prepared by the Commission, was published in September by the Government Printing Office. If you write directly to the Commission, you can get a copy free—but hurry; only 75,000 have been printed. Write to Professor William E. Baringer, Executive Director, Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, Suite 14 N, National Archives Building, Washington 25. Just tell him ST told you about it.

BACK ISSUE. The Secretary's Page of *The Forensic*, January number, mentioned that fifty mint copies of the Pi Kappa Delta publication, Vol. 1, No. 1, had been discovered. Curious about how this happened, we wrote to the secretary, D. J. Nabors of East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma. Here is the story. Malcolm O. Sillars of Los Angeles State College, associate editor of *The Forensic*, visited his old debate coach, the late E. R. Nichols. Discussion revealed that Professor Nichols, the first editor, had carefully preserved a number of back issues, including fifty copies of the first number. Secretary Nabors kindly sent us a copy; first issue was February 1915. It has many items of interest to the archivist, but some contemporary touches. An editorial suggests "Communication" as a national slogan. No publication dates had been arranged; the editor hoped to get out an issue annually.

RETIREMENT. Claude M. Wise retired from Louisiana State University in June. A conference in his honor was held May 16-17. Speakers included: Dean C. G. Taylor of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, N. M. Caffee of the Department of English, Loren Reid of Missouri, T. Earle Johnson of the University of Alabama. At the evening banquet, Giles Wilkeson Gray and Waldo W. Braden paid tribute to the retiring head of the department. Mr. Wise was editor of *QJS*, 1936-38.

Buildings and Curricula

Mount Holyoke College announces graduate study in the field of speech rehabilitation, leading to the degree M.A. in Speech, and basic certification by the American Speech and Hearing Association.

The new Speech and Hearing Center of

Hunter College was formally opened in January. The new facilities are at 695 Park Avenue. A testing area for deafness contains five sound-isolated amplifiers, microphones, and loudspeakers which permit students to observe clinical tests and therapy without being seen by the patients. Tests are performed with modern equipment such as the psychogalvanic skin resistance audiometer. One area of the Center, set up for the development of a program of rehabilitation of adults with impaired hearing, was made possible through grants given by the Doris Duke Foundation. Another area is designed for experimental investigations into the nature of normal and defective speech, the problems of foreign accent, and the cause and cure of "New York-ese" speech of students who want to teach.

Brooklyn College has a new Listening Room, equipped with 20 Webster Ekotapes in individual booths, 5 record players and several hundred records.

Brooklyn College also announces a new Master of Arts in the Teacher Education program for students preparing to teach speech in the secondary schools. It is tuition free for qualified students. The Division of Graduate Studies recently adopted a curriculum for students intending to teach speech improvement.

Northwestern University announces that this year two of its departments will have new titles: Speech Correction and Audiology will become Communicative Disorders, and Public Speaking will become Public Address and Group Communication.

At the University of Missouri, the Speech and Hearing Clinic has completed building plans for the new area. The quarters, expected to be ready this fall, will give the clinic staff about seven times as much space as at present, and will have a hearing laboratory and air-conditioned testing and clinic rooms. Plans for the new theatre wing of the Fine Arts building are now with the architects.

The University of Oregon is now offering a Ph.D. degree in speech.

The Speech and Hearing Clinic at Northern Illinois University plans to extend its services in clinical audiology, hearing aid evaluation, and speech training for the hard of hearing as soon as it moves into its quarters in the newly constructed Health Center.

Under construction at Louisiana State University is a new wing to the present Music and Dramatic Arts Building. This addition is to be occupied exclusively by the Department of Speech. It will provide additional classroom and office space as well as a large television studio which can also be used as an arena theatre.

The Fresno State College Speech and Hearing Clinic has moved to larger quarters on the campus. In 1960 the new two and one-half million dollar Speech Arts Building will be completed.

Nearing completion on the campus at Louisiana State University is a new three and one-half million dollar library. The original planning committee included Giles Wilkeson Gray, Professor of Speech.

The American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., at the corner of 18th Street, has purchased the four-story building two doors away at 1777 Massachusetts Avenue.

This property, fronting 24.66 feet on the avenue, adjoins the area now being cleared for the new 8-story building of the Brookings Institution. Occupants of the building will include the staff of the Council's Office of Statistical Information and Research, Commission on the Education of Women, and Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad.

The American Council, founded in 1918, includes in its membership 140 educational organizations (including SAA) and 1,021 institutions, among them nearly all the accredited colleges, junior colleges, and universities in the United States.

Egbert Ray Nichols died April 5 of a stroke. He was seventy-three. Professor Nichols retired from the University of Redlands in 1952. Following retirement he taught on a Fulbright at Imperial University in Japan, and at Bowdoin College.

He was born in Mt. Ayr, Indiana, on May 6, 1884. He was graduated in 1907 from Franklin College—which conferred upon him the Litt.D. degree in 1942—and received an M.A. from Harvard in 1909. He joined the faculty of Redlands in 1913. He served as director of debate, as producer of plays, and as chairman of the department of speech.

Professor Nichols was nationally known for his sponsorship of debating. Many of his students became distinguished in the fields of forensics and public affairs. For a number of years he edited *Intercollegiate Debates*, an annual collection published by Noble and Noble. From Nichols Publishing House, actually his home at 814 Campus Avenue, issued pam-

phlets and a journal, *Speech Activities*. With J. H. Baccus he was author of a textbook, *Modern Debating*. He was one of the founders of Pi Kappa Delta, national forensics honorary society, in 1913, and served as first president and as first editor of *The Forensic*, the society's journal. His son, Egbert Ray Nichols, Jr., is professor of speech and chairman of the department at Whittier College.

Wallace L. Garneau, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, died February 19, after a long illness. He had been on the faculty since 1938, as professor of speech and director of broadcasting. He was director of the university FM radio station, WMCR. Professor Garneau was graduated from Western Michigan in 1935, and received an A.M. from the University of Michigan in 1939.

TRAVEL AND STUDY ABROAD. Various professors have resumed their teaching schedules after completing leaves of absence spent in Europe. Among them are John W. Wright, Chairman of the Division of Speech Arts of Fresno State College, and Marie Hochmuth, professor of speech at the University of Illinois.

Ruth Clark, University of Denver, was a member of the Comparative Education Group, which visited schools and clinics in western, central, and southern Russia during August and September. Betty Jane McWilliams, University of Pittsburgh, observed methods of speech therapy used in British clinics. Barnard Hewitt, University of Illinois, visited theatres and theatre collections in libraries and museums on his summer tour of England, France, and Italy.

Among those now on leave are the following: C. Morton Talley, dean of the Southern Illinois University School of Communications, is touring Europe on a four-month sabbatical. Henry Mueller, on leave for 1958-59 from the University of Illinois, is studying the history of British film production and exhibition at the British Film Institute; he will also attend film festivals at Edinburgh, Cannes, Nice, and Venice. Dwight Freshley, Vanderbilt University, is spending the year at the American University, Athens, Greece. He is teaching English as a foreign language and inaugurating a forensic program, in addition to conducting research in phonetic problems involved in Greeks learning English. During his absence, William H. Veatch, professor emeritus, State College of Washington, will teach at Vanderbilt. Elmer Scholer, assistant in speech at the University of Illinois, has been awarded the Crown Princess Martha Fellowship by the American-Scandinavian Foundation for nine months of study in Norway; the study will be an analytical comparison of recreational systems with some emphasis on dramatics. Mr. Scholer is the first American to receive this award.

EXCHANGES. Lee S. Hultzén, University of Illinois, and Mrs. Elizabeth T. Uldall, University of Edinburgh, Scotland, will exchange positions this year. Both are specialists in phonetics. Mr. Hultzén will be accompanied by his wife and by his son, who will spend the year studying mathematics at Edinburgh. Mrs. Uldall is a specialist in teaching English to foreigners, and has taught in South America and the Middle East. She is a native American, however, having been born in Kearney, Nebraska.

Robert F. Ritterhoff, director of speech and radio in the Kamehameha schools, Honolulu, will exchange positions with Elizabeth Turnell of De Pauw University this year. Miss Turnell will take on Mr. Ritterhoff's duties as station manager of KVOK, the school's FM station, and Mr. Ritterhoff will serve in Miss Turnell's place as program director for WGRE, the De Pauw station in Greencastle.

APPOINTMENTS

Bethany College, Oklahoma City: Ellwood Tame, chairman of the department and associate professor.

Boston University: William R. Dresser, instructor and co-ordinator of forensics; Roy S. Azarnoff, instructor.

Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois: Theodore Kundrat, part time instructor.

Columbia University: Thomas Fay, audiologist and lecturer.

Grove City College: William R. McGraw, assistant professor of speech and director of theatre.

Illinois State Normal University: George A. Falconer, Stanley Rives, assistant professors; Patricia Bahn, Ray L. Fischer, teachers in the University High School.

Indiana University: J. Jeffery Auer, formerly chairman of the Department of Speech and Drama, University of Virginia, chairman of the Department of Speech and Theatre; Robert G. Gunderson, formerly chairman of the Department of Speech, Oberlin College, professor of

speech and theatre; Orville W. Wensley, formerly State Speech Consultant, Oregon Department of Education, lecturer in speech and theatre; Richard A. Harris, University of Maryland, Overseas Extension, lecturer in speech and theatre.

Northern Illinois University: Alvin Goldberg, Stanley Weisberger, assistant professors; Roger Hufford, instructor.

Northwestern University: Parke Burgess, assistant professor.

Parsons College: Charles Bartl, chairman and associate professor.

Potomac University, recently incorporated in Washington, D. C.: Winton H. Beaven, dean of the School of Graduate Studies. He retains his professorship of communication at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, now a part of Potomac.

Saint Joseph's College, Collegeville, Indiana: Francis E. X. Dance, assistant professor of speech.

San Francisco State College: Eugene Rebstock.

Southern Illinois University: Michael S. Hoshiko, Gene J. Brutten, assistant professors in speech correction.

University of Denver: Tom Pace, director of forensics.

University of North Dakota: Ronald Werner, instructor in speech and director of forensics.

University of Southern California: Robert W. Wagner, head of the cinema department, Division of Communication. Formerly director of Motion Picture Production at Ohio State University, Mr. Wagner succeeds Robert D. Hall, who has become Program Associate with the Educational Radio and Television Center at Ann Arbor, Michigan; Gale Richards, associate professor; Janet Bolton, assistant professor.

PROMOTIONS

Louisiana State University: with the retirement of C. M. Wise in June 1958, Waldo W. Braden became chairman of the department; Owen Peterson, executive secretary of SAA, associate professor.

Northern Illinois University: Raymond D. Wilderman, associate professor.

Northwestern University: Dean Barnlund, associate professor of public speaking; David Rutherford, assistant professor of speech correction; Paul Reinhardt, assistant professor of dramatic production.

Pomona College: Howard H. Martin, associate professor.

Southern Illinois University: John O. Anderson, assistant dean of the Graduate School; Isaac P. Brackett, chairman of the newly created department of Speech Correction, Pathology, and Audiology.

University of Hartford: Edgar L. Kloten, director of the University Theatre.

University of Illinois: Lawrence Olson, assistant dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; Marie Hochmuth, professor of speech; Genevieve Richardson, assistant professor.

University of Southern California: James H. McBath, associate professor of speech.

Vanderbilt University: Joseph R. Wright, professor of speech and drama; Dwight L. Freshley, associate professor of speech; Robert A. Baldwin, assistant professor of drama.

PERSONALS

Elton Abernathy of Southwest Texas State Teachers College is president of the Texas Association of College Teachers.

A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa emeritus '52, is teaching the fall term at Iowa. Winter and spring terms he will be at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Merlyn Burriss of Fresno State College is recording a library of audio-books for blind students in the Fresno city schools.

Janice M. Crews, University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division, attended the performance of *Iphigenia in Tauris* in June at the Festival of Epidaurus in Greece. The open air theatre at Epidaurus was designed by Polycleitus in the fourth century, B.C., and seats 17,000 people.

Lionel Crocker was guest critic at the International Convention of Toastmasters in Pittsburgh in August.

John Dietrich of Ohio State was the speaker at the 24th Annual Conference on Speech Education at Louisiana State University in June.

Walter B. Emery of Michigan State, member of the District of Columbia Bar, has opened offices in East Lansing for the practice of communications law before the federal courts and administrative agencies.

Seth A. Fessenden, who has been on leave from Montana State University to be Director of Educational Research for Toastmasters International, has now resigned from Montana to devote his full attention to Toastmasters.

Donley Fedderson of Northwestern is now program consultant to WTTW, the educational television station in Chicago.

Herbert Koepp-Baker of the Asheville Orthopedic Hospital will be Visiting Distinguished Professor in the department of speech correction at Southern Illinois University the winter quarter.

Jack Matthews of the University of Pittsburgh has been elected to the Board of Associates of his alma mater, Heidelberg College. He also is the new president of the American Association for Cleft Palate Rehabilitation.

Helmer Myklebust of Northwestern was awarded the honorary Litt. D. by Gallaudet College in June.

Carrie Rasmussen has resigned from the Madison, Wisconsin, public schools in order to have time to participate in workshops and institutes, the kind of work she most enjoys. She will teach part time in the University of Wisconsin Extension Division. This summer she taught at Drury College, Springfield, Missouri.

Lousene Rousseau, first news and notes editor of *QJS* (1922), now Speech Editor for Harper & Brothers, periodically edits a folder, *Harper Speech Texts.*

Roberta D. Sheets, SAA Emerita, '57, received a citation from Shattuck School, Fairbault, Minnesota, for her work in speech and drama at Roosevelt High School, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The award was part of the centennial celebration of Shattuck, in which ten teachers were cited for their contributions to the advancement of secondary school education. She attended the celebration in June.

Clarence Simon of Northwestern has returned after a year at the University of Washington in Seattle.

Irving C. Stover, for fifty years chairman of the department at Stetson University, was cited for his service at a banquet in his honor. He was presented with a phonograph and records, and an artist has been commissioned to do his portrait for presentation to the university.

Lee E. Travis, who left the University of Southern California for business, will return to academics part time this year to teach a course in speech pathology at USC.

EDITOR OF *MONOGRAPHS*

John W. Black of Ohio State University is the interim editor of *Speech Monographs.* He will serve until December 31, 1959. Appointment of an interim editor was necessary because of the death of Howard Gilkinson.

NEW SAA VOLUME. Subjects and contributors have now been selected for the volume of studies, *Speaking in the Old South, 1830-1860.* Waldo Braden is chairman of the editorial committee. Other members are J. Jeffery Auer and Lindsey Perkins. In announcing the completion of assignments, chairman Braden paid tribute to the late Dallas Dickey, the original chairman of the editorial committee: "Dallas did an excellent job in starting us well on our way toward a successful project. It behooves us to make this volume a real memorial to him." The studies will be concerned with movements and occasions; there will be no individual studies of speakers. Here is the list of subjects and contributors:

Southern Oratory	Douglas Ehninger
The Nullifiers	Ralph T. Eubanks
The Anti-Nullifiers	Merrill C. Christophersen
The Democrats	Lindsey Perkins
The Whigs	Robert Gunderson
The Southern Commercial Convention	Owen Peterson
The Know-Nothings	J. Jeffery Auer
The Fire-Eaters	H. Hardy Perritt
The Unionists	James L. Golden
Religious Speaking	Robert D. Clark
School and College Speaking	Donald Ecroyd
Holiday, Anniversary, and Occasional Speaking	Robert C. Jeffrey

NEW JOURNAL. *Critique,* a critical review of theatre arts and literature, is sponsored by the National Catholic Theatre Conference. It is issued three times a year, with Vol. 1, No. 3, scheduled for November. The journal is illustrated. Robert Smett, Nazareth College, Rochester, New York, is editor.

TWO NEW JOURNALS: Cultural Services of the French Embassy, 972 Fifth Avenue, New York 21, now issues two journals designed to inform us of French culture and of French-American inter-cultural relations. In the first issue of *Education in France,* December 1957, Hervé Alphand, the French ambassador, says: "The West has been shocked into realizing that the military co-operation of NATO is not enough to insure its security. . . . We of the free world must learn to work and to think together." The journal carries a list of American professors visiting France, and of French savants lecturing in the United States. Issue two has a history of the baccalaureate degree from 1275 to the present. The syllabus in 1275, the journal reports, was very severe, but if the mediaeval student did not care for it, a degree could be arranged

at some universities, for a consideration. The second publication, *French News*, is also designed for those of scholarly interests. Extensive bibliographies are given, and a section on the French theatre is illustrated. Both journals are issued quarterly, and are free upon request.

FROM THE CLIO MINUTES

A curious thing about minutes is that one never knows whether they ever will be looked at again. On the other hand, they may become celebrated. King James, that day in 1621 when he descended on Parliament and ripped out a third of a page of the journal, probably did not realize that three centuries later the mutilated book would be on display in a glass case in Westminster Palace.

The photostats of the Cliosophic Society minutes, referred to in the opening essay, reveal that records for the period were carefully preserved. The handwriting is handsome, with various spencerian flourishes. Here are some excerpts:

April 9, 1852. Proposed, that the design for the Washington Monument Block be adopted. Amended, that the words "Nassau Hall" be substituted for "Princeton" on the block.

December 17, 1852. Proposed and carried that the Monument Committee be instructed to endeavour to obtain a reduction in the price of the block and if this cannot be done to agree to the accompanying modification.

June 10, 1853. A letter from F. S. Giger reports the stone is ready and the total cost is $150. "Could you send on the balance in the course of this week?" he wrote.

October 14, 1853. Proposed and carried out that the model of the Clio Block be placed in the Hall over the President's desk.

September 13, 1854. The finance committee reported: "When the year opened we were much in debt. For the block of marble sent to the Washington Monument about $182 was yet unpaid." Introduction of gas into the hall had left a further indebtedness of $200. However, by that meeting all bills were paid, and there was a surplus of $14.18 3/4. The report concludes in grateful tone: "The Committee in thus reporting the present prosperous state of the Hall would return thanks to Providence for its All Protecting Arm. It has smiled on us. From our bosom have gone many of the most distinguished men of the land, and we hope to send forth many more. Often again may *Cliosophic* brothers here meet to enjoy the flow of the friendship, and may God ever keep us under his care."

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA. The 20th summer program was held at the University of Michigan, July 25-26. Attendance was 300. Albert H. Marckwardt of Michigan, vice-president of the society, was the host-arranger.

THE LISTENER SPEAKS. Anyone seeking relaxation from a tempestuous world might turn to *The Listener* for relief. It is published weekly by the British Broadcasting Corporation, and is available on the stands in Britain at fifteen cents. It is a companion piece to broadcasts, and most of the articles are transcripts of radio and television lectures. But the journal carries no indexing of programs, and is quite a unit in itself; one could enjoy it without being aware at all that there is such a thing as the wireless. There are reviews of novels, tours through the London galleries, recipes on jam-making, essays on the disestablishment of the Church of England. It is all done in that fine British unconcern for anything which is merely immediate, popular, or useful. A column called "The Spoken Word" takes care of the elocutionary aspect, with such remarks as commendation of "Stephen Murray's really superb reading from Browning's *The Ring and the Book*" (No. 1528, July 10, 68).

In the June 12 issue the editor writes about "American English." The occasion was a review of Albert H. Marckwardt's *American English*. The editor recalls the story about the shop in Paris which displayed a sign reading, "English Spoken—American Understood." There is much to marvel about in American speech, the editor thinks. A line from Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*, given in Marckwardt, arouses his curiosity: "I knowed you wasn't Oklahomy folks. You talk queer kinda—That ain't no blame, you understan." But he generously observes that as great a deviation from English might occur in Devonshire or Aberdeen, but not quite the same variety. The editor optimistically concludes: "It is striking how few are the differences in English usage throughout the world. . . . We can still talk confidently of 'the English-speaking people.'"

A History of the Southern Speech Association, written by Dallas Dickey, and run in issues of *The Southern Speech Journal*, has been collected into a booklet, and can be had for one dollar. Address Mary L. Gehring, Executive Secretary, Southern Speech Association, Stetson University, Deland, Florida.

university of denver
SCHOOL OF SPEECH

examples of advanced programs of study

MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE

52½ graduate quarter hours without thesis
45 graduate quarter hours with thesis

major concentrations	cognate areas
Discussion and Public Address	Communication Methodology
Speech and Hearing Disorders	Psychology
Communication Methodology	Theatre Arts
Oral Interpretation	Radio and TV

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE

majors	minors	cognate areas
Public Address and Discussion	Speech Pathology	Communication Methodology
Speech Pathology and Hearing	Communication Methodology	Psychology and Special Education
Theatre Arts	Oral Interpretation	English Literature
Communication Methodology	Mass Media	Business Administration or Social Science
Mass Media	Communication Methodology	English Literature

ROCKY MOUNTAIN SPEECH CONFERENCE

28th Annual General and College Meeting ..... February 12, 13 and 21
28th Annual High School Meeting ..... February 20 and 21

1959 SUMMER SESSION

7th Workshop for Directors of Forensics ..... June 22-July 24
24th Summer High School Institute ..... June 22-July 24
13th Summer Laboratory in Interpersonal Communication .... June 15-Aug. 14
12th Summer Workshop in Basic Communication ..... June 15-July 17

autumn quarter
September 18-December 5, 1958

winter quarter
January 5-March 20, 1959

spring quarter
March 30-June 10, 1959

summer session
June 15-August 14, 1959

for further information write:

ELWOOD MURRAY, Ph.D., Director
School of Speech, Box A
University of Denver
Denver 10, Colorado